

John F. Burrell, Mountain View.
Albert L. Brady, Oran.
Lizzie A. Rademaker, Parma.

NEBRASKA

Arthur F. Jarman, Ashland.
Eugene V. Hickok, Atkinson.
Laura M. Baird, Cairo.
Earl J. Hughes, Concord.
Alexander E. Etting, David City.
Henry L. Nichols, Lebanon.
William Mankin, Lisco.
Mamie Mathews, Marsland.
George W. Whitehead, Mason City.
Walter I. Farnham, Merna.
Henry D. Grady, O'Neil.
Etta H. Bartlett, Potter.
Margaret Bolan, St. Columbans.
Olaf H. Larson, Shickley.
Mabel E. Bigelow, Ulysses.
Sara I. Barritt, Union.
George E. Barto, Wakefield.
Murry K. Holley, Waverly.
Lillian A. Elliott, Westpoint.
George H. Holdeman, York.

NEW YORK

Richard J. Higgins, East Rockaway.
Clarence J. Weyant, Fort Montgomery.
Roy M. Hackett, Hornell.
Edwin W. Cushman, Keuka Park.
James Agnew, Lake Ronkonkoma.
Edith L. Kent, Tuxedo Park.
Anna M. Smith, West Albany.
Loie C. Husted, Woodhull.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Matilda Peterson, Agar.
Dana N. Bonesteel, Artesian.
Nellie M. Sullivan, Athol.
Ezra J. F. Lamkee, Avon.
Loretta M. Stromme, Garretson.
Robert H. Benner, Gary.
Adam F. Glaser, Herrick.
Harry O. Starksen, Hetland.
Harry K. Sanborn, Harley.
Oscar D. Hansen, Irene.
Leland K. Stoddard, Parker.
Fred Chesley, Platte.
Joseph W. Gibson, Salem.

VERMONT

Hiram E. Rowe, Barnet.
William H. C. Whitcomb, Forest Dale.
Ethel E. Churchill, Quechee.
Irwin Mattison, South Shaftsbury.
Otis B. Dauchy, Townshend.
Kenneth A. Foster, Wolcott.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, December 11, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of wisdom, God of love, Thou are the way, the truth, the life. Do Thou unite us in knowledge and in purpose that our service to our country may be full of thoughtful consideration. Always keep us in sympathetic touch with human relationships and human needs. Meet us in the way of duty and make it plain and sure. In all the best demands of life may we take our pledge to live and to labor for the good. May we pass through these days with hearts of gladness and with spirits that serve, and thus may we lift some burden, lighten some load, and brighten some way. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7052. An act for the relief of Geston P. Hunt; and
H. R. 8687. An act to authorize alterations to certain naval vessels and to provide for the construction of additional vessels.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10404) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 10404, with Mr. TREADWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill. When the committee rose on Tuesday it had completed the reading of the bill down to and including page 80. The Clerk will resume the reading at page 31.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

SALARIES

For the Chief Forester and other personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, and for personal services in the field, \$3,325,003.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say what I had intended to say during the general debate. I was unavoidably absent on Tuesday.

As most of the Members of the House know, March 4 will end my public service and this will probably be the last time I shall have the privilege of cooperating in the passage of an Agricultural appropriation bill. I do not want to let this occasion pass without expressing my appreciation of the generous and kindly cooperation which I have received at all times from the members of the subcommittee, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and the Members of the House in general on both sides of the aisle. I particularly want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE], who has taken charge of this bill last year and this year. I appreciate the fact that he has done this under rather difficult circumstances, especially last year, because he had no opportunity for prior preparation, which is so desirable, if not necessary, in conducting a bill through this body.

I should deprive myself of a very great pleasure and my colleagues of a tribute which is due them if I did not say that my contacts and associations with the Members of the committee and the House have been of the most kindly and cordial character. I can not say I leave public life entirely without regrets. I have enjoyed my public service beyond measure, but my chief regret will be in severing the ties and the relationships which I have had with the Members of the committee and the House, and the memory of these relationships and friendships will be among the most treasured memories of my life as I leave this place on March 4. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is with profound regret that I contemplate the loss to the public service of the invaluable services of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. It has been my pleasure to have been associated with him in subcommittee work on this bill, and it has been my observation that on every measure he considered only the merits of that measure and the good to result to the country at large from any appropriation made to carry it into effect. In his deliberations upon the committee I can truthfully say that he regarded not sections, he regarded not party, but responded to the impulse of what he conceived to be his duty to act for the best interests of the Nation. The agricultural interests of this country suffer a great loss by reason of his retirement from this House. [Applause.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune during the early days of my membership in this body to be assigned to a committee of which my friend and colleague SYDNEY ANDERSON was a member. From that time until this date circumstances have kept us close together in committee work.

I rise at this time to emphasize every word of praise that has been spoken by Mr. MAGEE of New York and Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas, in behalf of the public service of Mr. ANDERSON. As a member of the committees where I have served with him and under him, I have always found him a genial, courteous, and capable advocate of the best interests of the agricultural development of this country.

He possessed a clear mind, a keen intellect, and it is rarely discovered that any Member of this body understands more clearly the pressing needs and demands of agricultural development than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

I personally am sorry that he is to leave us. I regret to think of the day when my friend will not go with us further in helping legislation and providing appropriations in the interests of agricultural development. In his new vocation I know we all wish him the marked success that he has enjoyed during his service in this House and hope that his new activities may be as pleasant and successful as his service here. God speed him in his new work. He leaves with our sincere regrets and our highest esteem and appreciation. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES, FOREST SERVICE

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved shall not exceed \$1,500; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting in the forest reserves to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, and soil waste, and the formation of floods, and including the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, office fixtures, law books, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, and washing towels, and official traveling, and other necessary expenses, including travelling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows:

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and also to insert a brief article by Doctor Coville on experiments in rhododendron culture, which I think is very interesting and relates to the blueberry culture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record and insert an article by Doctor Coville. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, in the hearings before the committee there is some discussion relative to the blueberry industry. It is shown that in one State the value of the crop from the blueberry fields where they grow wild is over \$2,000,000. There is the same situation in other States where the

profuse fruiting of the bushes brings about an interesting and paying industry. There is probably no other wild fruit in our country which grows so freely and produces so abundantly such a delicious fruit. Throughout the South there is the huckleberry, while not of the same plant family is close kin and the fruit is much alike.

It is a matter of serious consideration if a pest has been found which if let alone would destroy this source of food. The hearings before the committee show that a fly is attacking the fruit of the blueberry in certain sections of Maine. It is gratifying to know that the committee has responded to the call of the Department of Agriculture and inserted a provision under which an investigation will be made as well as efforts to destroy this attack.

The blueberry industry, which extends into a great many sections, has been investigated by the Department of Agriculture, and for many years they have experimented with both the blueberry and huckleberry. The results have been most successful. The bulletins published by the Department of Agriculture give details of the series of experiments with blueberry seedlings brought about by hybridization. It will be seen that in the early efforts of experimentation back in 1906, in the limited quarters, there was evidence of great improvement. There were made discoveries of the soil requirements. It was proven that a much larger and more attractive berry could be produced. The work in Washington in the restricted quarters demonstrated there was a promising field for development. The Government expanded the work by leasing a field in New Jersey where, with outdoor space of many acres and favorable soil conditions, there was an opportunity for great development. Different varieties of hybrids were grown and larger berries produced. A group of varieties was produced with favorable bearing qualities. The berries had been increased to a much larger size which can be appreciated when it is stated that they are about the same size as the familiar Concord grape. This was a great accomplishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three minutes. This is the most eloquent speech I ever heard on the subject of blueberries. [Applause.]

Mr. FISHER. From a wild, fruit-bearing bush our Government experts produced a beautiful, luscious fruit, which will mean much to our markets. Commercial growers are planting orchards to fill a demand which will await them. There is one farm in New Jersey where 50 acres are under cultivation, and a good part of this is producing large quantities of berries which are quickly sold to markets in neighboring cities.

This would indicate the development of a big, paying industry. These experiments resulting in so fine an accomplishment were conducted by Dr. Frederick Coville, of the Bureau of Plant Industry, together with colleagues from other branches of the department, particularly of the Bureau of Soils.

Important and interesting as this valuable contribution is, produced by rare skill in hybridization, it means much to the development of all plant industry, for there was also discovered much knowledge relating to soil requirements. These experiments produced facts which extend to many other interesting plants. For instance, it was found that the blueberry and huckleberry require an acid soil, and that other valuable plants, much prized in the field of horticulture, have the same requirements. In sections of our country where the soil is either neutral or alkali in reaction, the many efforts by gardeners to grow such plants as azaleas, rhododendrons, and kalmia latifolia or mountain laurel have failed. That is a familiar condition in many parts of our country, and the efforts to raise these attractive shrubs have been abandoned.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A HALF-ROTTED AND A FULL-ROTTED OAK LEAF

Many of these unfortunate experiments are personally known to me, both in my garden as well as my neighbors'. This problem of how to make blueberry, huckleberry, azaleas, and other such plants grow in a soil which is apparently hostile seems to have been solved through these experiments. If acid soil can not be obtained to substitute for the soil with the alkali reaction, then there is recommended the removal of the soil and the substitution of a mixture partly of half-rotted oak leaves (the red oak preferred) with sand at given proportions with the native soil; also other things are suggested to continue and increase the amount of acidity in the soil. These plants when planted according to the directions and well cared for seem to thrive, where theretofore they withered and died. There are also experiments being made

in the use of a chemical. The processes and methods of use are clearly presented in a number of articles written by Dr. Edgar T. Wherry, of the Bureau of Soils, who has been a party to the investigations of the soil needs of the blueberry.

And the most interesting feature of the findings was the discovery that the red oak leaf is a source of help in keeping a naturally nonacid soil in a more nearly acid condition. Everybody is familiar with the red oak. The good fortune is mine to live in a neighborhood where there are many grand red oak trees—in my own yard there is a wonderful twin red oak. The leaf of this tree in the fall is large, brown, and has a leathery look. It is slower to rot than other leaves, and through the process of degenerating, which takes from one to two years, unless aided by different methods, it retains an acid condition which is transmitted to the soil where it is rotting. When the rotting leaf reaches a stage called leaf mold it has somehow changed to an alkali reaction and no longer would it be of value to the plants described, unless mixed with leaves at an earlier stage of decomposition, which is accomplished by adding new leaves from time to time. It is to be understood that there are many beautiful plants which would revel in a supply of any kind of leaf mold and do not require a special soil. All of this adds great interest to those who would welcome a new and attractive fruit and the knowledge given in the findings as to methods of overcoming soil difficulties which have hitherto been almost a bar to the cultivation of many plants in different sections of our country. [Applause.]

Under the leave to extend I insert the following article by Doctor Coville:

EXPERIMENTS IN RHODODENDRON CULTURE
(By Frederick V. Coville, March 20, 1923)

In the course of a series of experiments with blueberry seedlings, 1906 to 1910, it was found that these plants require an acid soil. (Experiments in blueberry culture, 1910, published as Bulletin 193, Bureau of Plant Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, 100 pages of text, 18 plates, 31 text figures. Now out of print.) The experiments have since been extended to many other plants and it has been shown conclusively that a very large number of species in ornamental horticulture have the same requirement. Lack of success is due to failure to provide them with the acid soil they demand. This is true especially of rhododendrons and nearly all other plants of the heather family, such as azalea, mountain laurel (*Kalmia latifolia*), trailing arbutus (*Epigaea repens*), and heather (*Calluna vulgaris*).

In nature acid nourishment is provided by the accumulation on the surface of the ground of a layer of half-rotted leaves, twigs, and rootlets. Such an accumulation, when it occurs in a sphagnum bog, is called bog peat, or simply peat. On well-drained sandy or gravelly soils it is called upland peat. Under good conditions upland peat is laced into a tenacious mat, a few inches in thickness, by the roots of the ericaceous plants that accompany it, and this mat persists year after year, continually renewing itself through each year's leaf fall and the penetration of new roots into the decaying mass. Upland peat is normally brown, but is often blackened by ground fires.

On limestone soils or on soils which for any reason have an alkaline chemical reaction upland peat does not form. The lime and other alkaline substances in the soil greatly hasten the decomposition of the leaves. Each year's leaf fall is decomposed, much of it passing in liquid form into the underlying soil prior to the leaf fall of the following year. Fully decomposed leaves form a true leaf mold, black in color and neutral or alkaline in reaction, in which rhododendrons and other acid-soil plants will not grow.

The continuation of acidity in upland peat is due to the arrest of decomposition before it has progressed to the alkaline stage, and the chief factor in the arrest is the lack of lime in the soil that underlies the leaves. When an upland peat mat is once established its own acidity is fatal to the life of the organisms that as agents of rapid decay would soon destroy its acidity.

In soils derived from granite, sandstone, sand, and gravel acid conditions are usually maintained with little difficulty by the addition of upland peat, half-rotted oak leaves, or decayed wood or bark.

Sawdust and spent tanbark are acid materials useful as mulch for acid-soil plants. They should be applied experimentally at first, however, to test the safety and suitability of the particular kind that is available. Some kinds of sawdust, notably red cedar and pitch pine, contain, when fresh, substances that are directly injurious. Other kinds, such as basswood, maple, and birch, are free from these substances. In general it is best to use sawdust that is weathered and somewhat decayed.

When an attempt is to be made to grow rhododendrons or other acid-soil plants in a place in which the soil is neutral or alkaline, such as a limestone soil, the bottom land of a river valley, the ordinary fer-

tile garden, or a prairie or arid-region soil, it is necessary to prepare holes or trenches and make up a special soil mixture. This should consist of one part of clean sand to one or two, or even four, parts of upland peat or its equivalent. To keep earthworms from bringing up the underlying soil the bottom of the hole should be lined with a 2-inch layer of soft-coal cinders. The depth of the peat and sand mixture need not be more than 8 to 12 inches. A permanent mulch of oak leaves will help maintain a proper degree of moisture, and by decomposition will add to the peat supply. If the materials for the mixture are available in quantity, a bed may be laid down over the whole surface of the ground.

A sharp distinction should be made between half-rotted oak leaves and the ordinary compost of leaves with manure, garden soil, and garden trash. Such a compost is neutral or alkaline in reaction and should not be used on acid-soil plants. Sugar maple, elm, and linden leaves rot rapidly and so soon reach the alkaline stage that they also are not desirable for application to an acid-soil planting. Oak leaves, especially red-oak leaves, rot slowly, and in two or three years, if the pile is turned over several times, make a good substitute for upland peat. (For a more extended discussion of the decay of leaves and its relation to acid soils see "The formation of leaf mold," Smithsonian Report for 1913, pp. 333 to 343.)

No manure, lime, or wood ashes should be applied to rhododendrons or other plants that require an acid soil, for all these substances tend to neutralize the necessary acidity. Cottonseed meal, ground soy beans, and spent malt, all of which contain a large amount of nitrogen in organic and acid form, are excellent fertilizers for acid-soil plants. In very sandy soils for which so little peat is available that the plants suffer for nourishment the following special acid fertilizer devised for blueberries and cranberries would probably do well for rhododendrons, applied at the rate of an eighth to a fourth of a pound per square yard. (From p. 20 of "Directions for blueberry culture, 1921," Bulletin 974, United States Department of Agriculture, 24 pp. and 29 pls.)

	Pounds
Nitrate of soda	17
Dried blood	23
Steamed bone	34
Phosphate rock	34
Potash	17

A series of greenhouse experiments in the last two years has shown that an ordinary fertile garden or greenhouse soil well suited to roses but fatal to rhododendrons can be acidified by the application of crude aluminum sulphate, and will then nourish rhododendron seedlings almost as well as peat and sand. (For a detailed account of these experiments see "The effect of aluminum sulphate on rhododendron seedlings," 1923, Bulletin 1, American Horticultural Society, 6 pages and 5 plates.)

These experiments will be extended during the coming season to larger rhododendron and other acid-soil plants in the deeper soil of outdoor plantings. For such situations, it is believed, amounts of aluminum sulphate up to half a pound per square yard may be applied advantageously and safely if the soil is of the ordinary fertile type, the application being repeated if the soil is not made acid by the first application.

Outdoor experiments with aluminum sulphate should not be tried in mixed plantings unless it is known that all the plants are suited to a strongly acid soil, because the ordinary plants of horticulture, which thrive best in a neutral or alkaline situation, are likely to be severely injured or killed by the aluminum sulphate.

For the present the aluminum-sulphate treatment should be regarded as experimental. Those desiring to try it on sickly rhododendrons should apply it to only a portion of a planting, always leaving another portion untreated for comparison.

Limestone water, which is alkaline in reaction, will ultimately injure an acid-soil planting. Rain water or some other water that is neutral or even acid in reaction should be used if practicable. If only alkaline water is available for sprinkling purposes, it can be made neutral or slightly acid by dissolving in it a suitable amount of aluminum sulphate. The proper amount can be determined by adding to a teaspoonful of the treated water in a white dish a fraction of a drop of the dye known as bromthymol blue. If the amount of aluminum sulphate added to the water was just sufficient to make it neutral, its color under this test will be green; if it has become acid, yellow; if it is still alkaline, blue. (For an account of the method of determining the degree of soil acidity see Edgar T. Wherry, 1922, "Soil acidity—its nature, measurement, and relation to plant distribution," Smithsonian Report for 1920, pages 247 to 268, with 1 plate and 1 color chart.)

Ornamental plants vary in the degree of soil acidity or alkalinity to which they are best adapted. The preparation of authentic lists of species on this basis will necessarily be a slow procedure, the outcome of careful experimentation, but fortunately a general though not infallible guide to the need of soil acidity for a particular species is already in existence in such well-known works on gardening as Nicholson's Illustrated Dictionary of Gardening and Bailey's Standard Encyclopedia of Horticulture. European gardeners have learned from long and cumulative experience that certain plants thrive best when

supplied with peat, and this knowledge has been handed down to us in garden literature and in garden practice when conducted intelligently, but never apparently with any suggestion that the essential quality of the peat was its acidity. The statement in any reliable work on gardening that a particular species requires peat may be taken as good evidence that this species is an acid-soil plant. In very many cases, however, especially in American works, even this evidence is lacking.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A year ago on the way to the north rim of the Grand Canyon, traveling through the Kaibab National Forest in a late afternoon, we were treated with the sight of some hundreds of wild deer that had come down into the open spaces or parks to graze. That is one of the great attractions to the public. Those who visit the national park seem to be more interested in the wild life than they are in the spectacles of inanimate nature. Dave Rust has provided a camp in V. T. or Demott Park, one of the open spaces in the Kaibab where people are accommodated over night who desire to watch the deer that come down in the open spaces and after many years of protection from the hunter have become so tame.

The Department of Agriculture has been agitating the question of the destruction of a large number of these deer in the Kaibab Forest, alleging that the number had become so great that there was not forage enough for them. Of course, nature has been taking care of a problem like that in the wilds for a good many centuries, but the department feels that it is necessary to permit men with guns to go in and kill off the surplus of those deer. There has been some question about the working out of the plan. I have a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, under the date of December 10, dealing with the situation which I shall ask to put in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, December 10, 1924.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMTON: The department is in receipt of your letter of November 29.

It is assumed from your question that you are familiar with the efforts which have been made in the last two months to remove from this area some 15,000 surplus deer. Several plans for accomplishing this have been worked out. For your information there is inclosed a copy of the special report to the department by the committee of experts who examined the area.

There have been several news dispatches from Flagstaff, Ariz., relative to the killing of the surplus deer on the Grand Canyon National Game Preserve. The first was to the effect that hunters were being allowed to kill not to exceed three head of deer each under a cooperative permit issued by authority of the late Secretary Wallace, who approved the plan prior to his death. This plan for removing surplus animals by hunting was put into effect only after we were satisfied that the first plan, namely, the giving away of the surplus deer, was a failure.

Despite the fact that a news item offering these deer free to any one who would pay the cost of crating and hauling to the railroad was published in almost every paper in the United States, we received orders for less than 300 deer, coming from about 50 separate individuals. About November 15 heavy snows over the Kaibab region made it impossible to continue the trapping and shipment of the animals, rendering it necessary to abandon that plan for the rest of the winter.

Under the Secretary's authority, the district forester at Ogden, Utah, was authorized to open the area to hunting, as stated. This went into effect early in November and continued for several days until stopped through the action of the sheriff of Coconino County, Ariz., who, under orders from the Governor of the State of Arizona, arrested three hunters from the neighboring State of Utah for having in their possession deer meat in violation of State law. This, of course, put an end to the issuance of further permits, as hunters naturally would not apply for permit with a prospect of being arrested. During the few days hunting was carried on approximately 388 deer were killed by 151 hunters. None of the deer were fat or even in fair condition. A five-point buck, called the "monarch of the herd," weighed, dressed, 153 pounds, showing the state of flesh of most of these animals.

In the meantime on application from the State game warden a permit was issued to the Governor of Arizona by the Secretary of Agriculture, early in November, for driving a large number of the deer ranging on the east side of the Kaibab Mountain but north of the canyon across the canyon and out on the south side. It should be understood that this drive necessitates the rounding up and driving of the deer—the contract calling for not more than 5,000 head—down a steep side canyon several miles in length, along and down one of the lower branches of the canyon for about 10 miles, swimming the river, and then climbing out over a 10 to 12 mile trail to the plateau on the south side of the canyon. The department has been doubtful whether

this plan is a practicable one, feeling that with the deer in a half-starved condition the drive would be very hard on them and would result in many losses through exhaustion, drowning, etc. It would also leave those that might reach the south plateau in poor condition to take care of themselves in a strange range during the coming winter. The plan was approved, however, in the hope that it would be more successful than we anticipated, and also to a certain extent being a direct but rather drastic means of reducing the surplus numbers in the herd.

Owing to complications in financing this drive, it has not yet been put in operation, although the permit was issued by wire on November 3.

In order to expedite matters and clear up several rather complicated situations the district forester in charge of this rather intricate problem of the distribution of the surplus deer proceeded to Phoenix, where he met in conferences Governor Hunt and the State game warden of Arizona. The result of these discussions was that the governor receded apparently from his position in arresting the Utah hunters for violation of State game laws and approved the continuation of hunting under the cooperative permit plan during a season from December 1 to January 5. This decision was also announced in Associated Press dispatches within the last few days and may be the one to which you refer.

We have not as yet received full information as to the result of the district forester's conferences with the Governor of Arizona. Apparently an understanding has been reached with the State authorities which will allow the department to continue to carry out its plans for reducing this herd of deer as rapidly as is possible. We are sincerely hoping the proposed drive will be carried out successfully. Everything which the department can do has been done and will continue to be done to assist the governor and the men in charge of the drive in putting it through.

I may say further that under this cooperative plan of hunting each cooperator contributes on the basis of \$5 for each deer killed, with a maximum of three deer to each hunter. One-fourth of the amount goes to the State and three-fourths to the Federal Government to cover the cost of supervising the hunting, the State not being put to any expense whatever in handling this matter.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. MARVIN,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have also the following letter from the department, giving data as to cattle grazing in the Kaibab:

(Fish and game, deer herd, cattle grazing)

KAIBAB, November 14, 1924.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMTON: The department has received your letter of November 7.

I am very glad indeed to furnish you the following information regarding the grazing of livestock on the Kaibab National Forest in Arizona, together with the receipts from grazing fees for the five-year period 1919 to 1923, inclusive. The table given here shows the grazing receipts for the period covered:

Year	Cattle and horses	Sheep and goats	Total
1919	\$7,525.32	\$659.37	\$8,184.69
1920	7,561.64	524.53	8,086.17
1921	7,054.67	647.68	7,702.35
1922	3,228.97	214.24	3,443.21
1923	5,375.31	467.40	5,842.71
Total	30,745.91	2,503.22	33,249.13

The following tabulation shows the number of stock grazed from and including the year 1912 to 1923, and also the estimated number of deer using the range with the livestock:

Year	Cattle and horses	Sheep and goats	Deer
1912	14,000	5,000	9,000
1913	13,000	5,000	12,000
1914	13,589	5,000	(1)
1915	15,303	5,000	(1)
1916	8,947	5,000	10,000
1917	8,354	5,000	15,000
1918	9,669	5,000	15,000
1919	9,209	5,000	15,000
1920	8,350	5,000	15,000
1921	7,404	4,375	20,000
1922	7,068	2,664	20,000
1923	5,685	3,660	25,000

¹ No estimate.

For the grazing season of 1924, just closed, the number of stock grazed was 3,339 cattle and 3,508 head of sheep, of which 1,000 were grazed for a short period due to drought emergency. These figures cover the stock grazed by a number of near-by settlers who are absolutely dependent upon the range within the Kaibab National Forest for grazing the stock on which they depend for a livelihood. There has never been but one large company operating on the Kaibab Forest, namely, the Grand Canyon Cattle Co., a California corporation, which purchased prior rights from old established settlers who used the range many years ago before either the game preserve or the national forest was created.

When the question of competition between the deer and the livestock became acute, reductions in the numbers grazed by the Grand Canyon Cattle Co. were at once begun, until from about 15,000, which they were grazing in 1906, they have been wholly eliminated from the forest. The company has not grazed any livestock on the forest during the season of 1924, and hereafter they will not be permittees. The rest of the permittees number approximately 67 individuals. Many of them graze not more than 20 head of cattle and several as low as 10 or 12 head. Only four of their number are grazing more than 200 head.

In considering the advisability of still further reducing the number of livestock using this forest the special committee of experts who recently investigated the conditions on the Kaibab reported that the stock now being grazed there are the property of numerous small stockmen wholly dependent upon this range for the support of themselves and families and the development of their farms and that "we have not the heart to recommend that the small cattle owner be entirely eliminated." It was the unanimous opinion of the committee in discussing the question of cattle grazing on this game preserve that while there was some competition between the two classes of animals, nevertheless, a total elimination of the cattle would not be more than a temporary relief, as the rapid increase of the deer herd would soon take up the slack gained by eliminating the cattle. The committee felt that the number of deer which this herd should properly contain should be about 15,000 head, which, if handled along proper lines of game management, could be grazed on the area with safety and at the same time take care of the stock belonging to these small settlers numbering approximately 3,000 head.

Very sincerely yours,

HOWARD M. GORE,
Acting Secretary.

There is just as much sport in killing one of these deer, after so many years of protection of game in the Kaibab—just as much sport about it as there would be to go into a barnyard and kill a cow.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Is it not a fact that in that forest there has been an unusually heavy drought and the attitude of the department is that it would be better to permit some deer to be used as food than to have them die of starvation?

Mr. CRAMTON. The attitude of the department is not based on any unusual occasion in the past year, for the reason that I visited the locality in June, 1923, before these conditions came into being that the gentleman mentions, and the matter was then being agitated. It is not based on unusual conditions but it is based on their claim that there is not enough food for them. I say there is no sport in killing these deer. They have, however, in their regulations limited it and surrounded it with conditions as they would surround sport. They limit each hunter to the killing of three deer. If it is sport it should be so limited. But if the hunter is performing a public service or a service to the deer in killing the deer there is no reason for limiting each of them to three. Why let every Tom, Dick, and Harry loose at these deer, frightening all, while a few hundred are killed? In authorizing this they came into conflict with the State of Arizona, which had at first refused to permit the slaughter and threatened to enforce the State law, which would result in the arrest of the hunters. That seems to have been adjusted, as the concluding paragraph of the letter of the department states. They charge each hunter a fee of \$5 for each deer that is killed; that is, with a maximum of three deer he is charged \$15.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I was wondering whether on the visit that the gentleman made in June he had any venison on the table?

Mr. CRAMTON. I did not. At that time they were not being killed, and I hoped then, and I hope yet, in some way there can be some arrangement by which they will not be

killed. The concluding paragraph of the letter sets forth that there has been an agreement arrived at between the department and the State of Arizona by which three-fourths of the \$5 goes to the United States and one-fourth to the State of Arizona. I do not know whether it is because the State of Arizona is to get a dollar and a quarter on each deer killed that has caused it to withdraw its opposition, but it appeals to me as a paltry financial mess. I do not know of anything that we can do to-day, but I hope the department will yet find a way to save this slaughter of 15,000 wild animals in a game preserve through so-called sportsmen. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter from the department and some comment with reference to the situation by Mr. Mather, the director of the National Park Service, President Ivens, and others.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. These gentlemen emphasize what a shame it will be to again drive these deer away from contact with man, as will result if they are hunted and find that the open spaces where they have so many years been safe have again become to them places of danger.

ARE KAIBAB DEER DOOMED?

In a recent issue of Outdoor America Stephen T. Mather, Director of the National Park Service, gave the following survey of the situation in the Kaibab, which he has frequently visited:

Fifteen thousand mule deer in the Grand Canyon National Game Preserve of northern Arizona must be removed or destroyed without delay if recommendations made by a committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the conditions affecting the Kaibab deer herd are carried out. No more drastic measure in the history of game conservation in America than this has ever been proposed.

The Grand Canyon National Game Preserve was established by President Theodore Roosevelt November 28, 1906, under an act of Congress approved June 29, 1906, for the protection of wild animals in the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve. This act authorized the President of the United States to set aside areas within the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve for the protection of game animals and to be recognized as a sanctuary and breeding place. For 18 years the deer on this preserve have been protected, although the region formerly was a great Indian hunting ground. When the preserve was first established the herd comprised about 3,000 deer which had survived the hunters and predatory animals owing to favorable geographical conditions. With the protection that the deer have had, not only from man but through the killing off of predatory animals within the preserve, the estimated number of deer in 1923 made by forest officers and experts of the Biological Survey placed the number at 20,000. It was also estimated that the fawn crop had then reached the birth rate of from 5,000 to 8,000 a year, of which about one-half might be assumed to survive.

Using the estimate of 1923 of 20,000, with the survival of the 1924 fawn crop, the number of mule deer now in the forest would number about 26,000. Local people place the number at not less than 50,000.

While the game preserve includes approximately 800,000 acres, it is maintained that because of lines of natural drift only a small part of the area is utilized by the deer, and that range conditions, due to overutilization, are so poor that the deer are actually facing starvation.

The increasing number of deer is not alone responsible for depleted range conditions. The entire area has for years been intensively grazed by livestock owned by cattle companies and local settlers, the latter being partly dependent upon this range for a livelihood in that industry.

While some effort has been made to adjust competition between cattle, horses, and sheep and the increasing wild life, reductions in the number of livestock permitted to graze having been made from time to time, the range has been poorly managed. While it is maintained that cattle and horses are not competitors of the deer for forage, as the deer feed largely on browse in preference to grass, the grass within the so-called drift limits has been so badly overgrazed that it is a question whether the cattle and horses, in addition to the sheep, have not long been serious competitors with the deer for their natural forage and vice versa. Since settlement of the West began there has been constant conflict between domestic livestock and wild life for existence and wild life has steadily lost. Fortunately a new attitude toward wild life has been developed by game conservationists and despite the drastic measures proposed by the Kaibab deer committee I am confident that they approached the problem with utmost sincerity and with the welfare of the deer paramount in their thoughts.

I am not, however, ready to agree that it is necessary to carry out their recommendations relating to the killing of large numbers of the deer. Another thing that should be mentioned in connection with handling of the Grand Canyon game preserve is man's mistake in de-

stroying nature's own means of balance. If the cougars or mountain lions had not been so systematically thinned out, they would have kept the increase of the deer down to a safe margin that the preserve could have carried, but the cougars were also destructive to the cattle and horses.

Referring again to the recommendations of the deer committee, it is stated that they are made solely for the purpose (1) of preserving the Kaibab deer herd for all time with the maximum number of deer that the area will support, and (2) of providing certain remedial measures in the existing emergency so that the range may recuperate. In view of the existing emergency, due to the severe overutilization of the range, it is recommended that stock should at once be removed from the forest, excepting the limited numbers belonging to local settlers, and the Grand Canyon Cattle Co., the largest users of the range, have been requested to remove the balance of their cattle at once and have agreed to do so under certain conditions. In view of the present situation the committee believes that no reduction of less than 50 per cent of the existing herd would be effective and recommends that one-half be removed as quickly as possible. This means a reduction of from 13,000 to 25,000 deer, depending upon the accuracy of estimates that have been made.

Three methods of reduction are suggested, and it is stated the committee is of one mind in the belief that "the proper and logical method to be followed in reducing the Kaibab deer herd is to ship the deer alive to other localities. By this means other areas where deer are not native or from which they have been exterminated may be restocked. In certain places in the Kaibab preserve it should be a comparatively easy matter to trap deer in considerable numbers. These could then be crated and shipped to other forests, preserves, parks, or private estates where conditions are suitable for their propagation and where proper care would be given them."

The second method of reduction is that the preserve be opened to hunting under careful regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, such hunting as may be necessary to be carried on along the lines of modern and approved principles of game management. It is recognized that to this there is one important practical difficulty in the administration and management of hunting—the price charged by the State of Arizona for a nonresident hunter's license. The fee is \$20 with a limit of one deer. There are few Arizonians north of the Grand Canyon, most of the people local to this section living across an imaginary line in Utah.

The third method, which is recommended only as a last resort, is for the Government officially to destroy as many of the deer as may be necessary. Here also many practical difficulties are admitted.

Regarding the first recommendation for the reduction of the deer, it is to my mind logical, sane, humane, and the one that should be completely tried out within reasonable limits of time and expense before any consideration is given to the opening of the preserve to hunting. The Kaibab Plateau is practically isolated by almost impassable natural barriers, although possible permanent lines of drift to the north and west are admitted. One is northeast across the desert valley between the Kaibab Plateau and the higher country of Utah to the north. In my four trips, the first in 1920, through this section of the country, I have talked with many of the local people regarding the possible drift of deer into the mountains of Utah, and have been informed by reliable persons that an increasing number of deer in Utah is reported. These have undoubtedly followed this route, although it was freely admitted that any considerable drift is largely prevented by hunters along the route. However, so far as I am advised, no attempt has been made that would encourage such a drift by educational work among the Utah people as to the advantages to be accrued in permitting this drift to freely take place.

Another route is westward toward the Mount Trumbull district. President Anthony W. Ivins, of the Mormon Church, has known this country for the past 50 or 60 years and has gained from his own personal observation information that deer from the Kaibab Plateau work into the surrounding district. It is reported, however, that this year forage conditions are extremely bad on and around Mount Trumbull, due to overutilization of range by domestic livestock. While the Kaibab deer situation has been studied for several years, no attempts have been made to induce drifts artificially from the Kaibab Plateau, and the only suggestions put forth in this connection have been that shooting would accomplish this. The local people are vitally interested in the deer, and yet, except superficially, the local people have not been consulted, although a few of the local people who appeared at the conference held by the committee at V. T. Park in August had some very intelligent thoughts on the subject which might well be given careful consideration. The local cattle industry is not a paying proposition, yet no effort has been made to have the local people undertake the capturing of the deer fawn for raising and shipment to other localities for propagating purposes. It is my belief that a profitable local industry could be built up in this connection with proper encouragement.

To my mind the greatest evil that would result in opening the preserve to hunting, no matter how strict the regulations placed into

effect, or from an unthinkable wholesale slaughter undertaken officially, would be the disturbance of the present tame condition of the deer herd that would wipe out the work of 18 years in protecting them.

I do not believe that proper realization is had of what a valuable asset this section has in this tame herd, which attracts a golden stream of tourist travel. Nowhere else in this country is it possible for tourists to see with so little effort the sight of wild game in such numbers, living peacefully in their native habitat. As a tourist attraction alone the Kaibab deer herd represents an asset to the States of Arizona and Utah that will result in hundreds of thousands of dollars annually being brought into this section, and to disturb their condition by hunting or slaughtering them would be nothing short of a crime. My view is shared by President Ivins, long familiar with this section, who writes:

"I held the exclusive right for the ranging of cattle in the Kaibab Forest for a number of years, and in 1895 sold these interests to other stockmen. During that period there was no protection for the deer, and while they existed in considerable numbers, the constant inroads made upon them by Indians and white hunters kept them in a state of terror, so that they were rarely seen and hard to approach. Since protection has been provided for them the deer have become gentle and have increased until there are a great number in the forest.

"One of the most interesting features of the trip to the north rim of the Grand Canyon is the great number of deer which are nearly always visible from the road. If the hunting of these deer were permitted, they would again become wild, would retire from the traveled road and be rarely seen by tourists who visit the forest. Because of these and for other reasons I sincerely hope that no step will be taken which will allow the killing of deer, at least in the forest. If it is to be allowed at all, it should only be upon the ranges adjacent to the mountains to which they naturally drift when the mountain itself becomes overcrowded."

These same views are held by many others who have known conditions before the preserve was created and who realize what a valuable asset these deer are now in their tame condition. So far as hunting itself would be concerned, there would be no more sportsmanship in killing these tame deer than there would be in approaching a herd of tame cattle and shooting them.

During the past several years immense strides forward have been made in opening southern Utah and northern Arizona to tourist travel. Only a few years ago this section was practically unknown, but since the creation of Zion National Park in southwestern Utah, Bryce Canyon National Monument in Utah, almost due north of the Kaibab, and the improvement of the road across the Kaibab forest to the north rim of the Grand Canyon National Park the attention of the traveling public has been directed there and already thousands of people annually are bringing new life and development into this country through the dollars they are leaving.

It now only requires a motor trip of five or six days to view all of these outstanding features, and with the improved road conditions which are steadily being accomplished it will be as comparatively easy to cover this section as it is now to tour Yellowstone National Park.

More than 140,000 people have toured Yellowstone Park this season in about a three months' period, and here the season will be longer. With the magnificent scenery and the picturesque wild life to attract tourists there will be an annual stream going through this country, 200,000 visitors who at the most conservative estimates will leave \$10,000,000. Disturbing the condition of the deer by killing them off would, it is believed, reduce the annual flow of tourist gold through lessened travel by \$2,000,000 or more. Even by the wildest calculations this loss could not be made up through the sale of hunting licenses or directly from hunters who would come in for no other purpose than to hunt. As a practical dollars-and-cents proposition, the killing of the deer should not be permitted.

If the deer herd ought to be reduced to help in bringing the range and forage conditions back to normal, let us not be stampeded, but give more time and thought to putting into effect corrective measures that do not sacrifice the deer utterly. A thorough and exhaustive study, extending over a period of a year if necessary, should be made into every factor of the problem and the actual number of deer should be determined. This should be definitely undertaken before the Kaibab deer are doomed.

Myron Hunt has emphasized the folly of indiscriminate hunting in the preserve when he said:

Their second suggestion is, as I understand it, that hunters be allowed to reduce the number of deer, and a third, that if this proves to be insufficient, the forest rangers be empowered to reduce the number of deer. It is these last two suggestions that I wish could be reversed. We all noticed many old and poorly conditioned deer. If the Forest Service were instructed to use rifles with silencers on them and to shoot particularly old bucks and to a large extent old does, part of the problem would be taken care of. The suggestion that they use silencers is the crux of the whole thing. Those of use who are interested in the Kaibab Forest as a game preserve and who have

enjoyed the tameness of the game, know what will happen once the hunters are allowed in the forest for a season, even though they are allowed in it for the purpose of saving the deer from starving.

My report from Washington, giving me a digest of the committee's statement, does not state what I assume the report itself will have stated, that the recommendation that hunters only be allowed on the perimeter of the mountain and that they be distributed in such a manner as to drive the deer to those portions of the mountain that they have for some unknown reason seemed least to frequent. If this is intelligently carried out, it is just possible that the deer will make of the center of the mountain a place of refuge and will at that point be comparatively tame as they are in the national parks, not more than a mile inside of the limits which they shortly come to understand as the limits beyond which hunters may not come.

The forest rangers spoke of their intention to use such methods, and if hunters are allowed in there, it is to be hoped that these methods will be carried out. I am sorry, and I think a large portion of the public will be sorry, to feel that there is not some method of reducing this herd that would not make the remaining deer so wild as to take away from them that tameness which is their present charm.

It will be noted the department makes no mention of any such safeguards as Mr. Hunt has suggested.

Gov. George W. P. Hunt, of Arizona, recently said:

I am very much opposed to the slaughter of these deer. There could be no sport in killing them, as they are almost as tame as cows in the field. I saw no evidence that the deer were in danger of starving, although I am advised that the lower plateau range is dangerously overstocked.

I have read the report in which the committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended the herd be reduced one-half, and I believe this to be unwarranted, as I do not think any such emergency exists.

It may be necessary to reduce the herd to some extent, and in doing so, I believe sufficient interest could be aroused among sportsmen to provide for the transporting of a part of the herd for restocking other areas.

The slaughter of these partially tamed animals should not be permitted.

A vigorous view has been that of the Phoenix Gazette in this editorial:

Sportsmen, real sportsmen, throughout the Nation will see red if the order is issued for the slaughter of half the Kaibab deer herd, as recommended in the preliminary report of the Forest Service committee to Secretary of Agriculture Wallace.

It is hard to conceive in this age that the Government would sanction the murdering of 15,000 deer, and murder is what it will amount to. The deer of Kaibab preserve have been the wards of the Government since 1906. There will be no sport involved in the killing of them, because they are as tame as calves. Hunters who will hunt the Kaibab deer will butcher them, will shoot them down with the lust of blood as their only incentive—shoot while the betrayed deer stand gazing at them with the great hazel eyes that have paralyzed the trigger finger of many a real sportsman.

The only excuse offered for the slaughter of the deer in Kaibab is the threatened destruction of the herd because of poor range conditions. The authorities are afraid to let nature take its course, or so they argue.

Nature is a grand old nurse to wild life. In the history of the great game herds of the West, man and not nature has destroyed them, just as man would now destroy the last remaining great deer herd of the Nation.

If nature is permitted to do its own thinning in the Kaibab forest, she will destroy the weaklings. If man slaughters, he will take only the strong and leave the weaklings to impoverish the future generations of this great herd.

Range conditions change yearly. There is every possibility this coming winter and spring will completely change the status of conditions in the Kaibab forest. Unless a deliberate and ruthless slaughter of the animals is engaged in man can not change the conditions sooner.

This is a matter of great importance in our program of game conservation and park development, and I believe should be worked out with more care and less haste than the letter from the department indicates now obtains.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I do not rise to-day to defend any policy of slaughtering wild animals needlessly, but I do say that this is a practical question. In that section of our country where the Kaibab is situated during the last few years, and particularly during the season just closed, there has been an unusual drought. The cattle grazing upon the ranges are in poor condition and some of the States have taken means of assisting the owners to get them through the winter. It will be impossible for much of this stock to graze upon the

public lands as they have in the past during the winter. I understand that the policy of the department is really one actuated by humane purposes, that a survey of the forage on the forest and immediate vicinities discloses that it can not graze or browse the number of wild deer now found there, and they are permitting certain hunters to go into these isolated sections for the purpose of killing a few of these deer, knowing full well that they will die if that is not done, and thereby saving a food supply to the people of that section of the country. It is simply a question of letting them die or killing them for food. I do not believe there is any attempt on the part of the department to spoil the pleasure of those who visit this forest. These few deer that are killed will not make the rest of them so wild in my opinion that they can not be seen. It is really a humane act. Unless something is done they will starve. Is it more humane to let them starve or shoot them?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman understand that the department has in mind the killing of some ten or fifteen thousand deer? I have not the figures at hand, but it is some such large number.

Mr. COLTON. I do not know the number it is intended to have killed. I did not understand that it was anything like so large a number; but the purpose is to reduce the number to a point where the forage of the forest will maintain them.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. The gentleman has spoken of the desirability of driving these animals back to the wilds and hunting and killing them for food purposes. Can they not be killed by humane means to save the forage without driving them back into the wilds and pursuing them?

Mr. COLTON. I think the gentleman is quite right. If there is a more humane way of killing than shooting, then use it. I would be in favor of a policy of that kind, but my understanding is that it is still a question of letting them die for lack of food or saving a part of them by reducing the number and using the number killed for food purposes. It will not necessarily drive them back to the wilds—they are already there.

Mr. KINDRED. Would it not be more economical to kill them humanely in their present state of tameness than to drive them back into the wilds and hunt them?

Mr. COLTON. That is correct, probably, if there is some practical way of doing it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have here the report of the survey made at the request of the department. They say:

The committee believes that as an immediate remedy for the present situation no reduction of less than 50 per cent of the existing deer herd would be effective. We therefore recommend that one-half of the existing herd be removed, and that its removal be accomplished as speedily as possible.

And it has been estimated that there are something like 50,000 deer there. I am not accurate as to the amount, but it is something like that, so that somewhere between fifteen and twenty-five thousand deer are to be killed.

Mr. COLTON. I think the gentleman's estimate is too high. I do not believe there are 50,000 head of deer in the Kaibab Forest.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] has just called my attention to the fact that deer are scarce in his State. He states they could pasture and feed a part of these deer. If the freight and express rates were not so high, these deer might be shipped to other States, where they could be cared for. I would like to see them taken to other States where the forage would sustain them; but if that can not be done, they ought not to be exterminated by starvation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of sanitary facilities and for fire-preventive measures on public camp grounds within the national forests when necessary for the protection of the public health or the prevention of forest fires, \$25,000.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAGON: Page 36, line 7, after the word "fires" strike out "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000."

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter in which I think every Representative here should be vitally interested. The improved road conditions of the national forests at this time have given rise to another condition, which provides one of the great perils of forestry in this country. I wish I could recall the exact figures that the Forestry Bureau gives us as the number of visitors that visited our national forests 6 or 8 or 10 years ago and the number that visit them to-day. Suffice it to say that in the year 1922 there were over 6,000,000 people who visited the national forests of the United States; and in 1924, the present year, I am advised by the forestry officials that over 10,000,000 people have gone through the 147 national forests in this country. That brings the condition about which I desire to speak. There are over 1,500 camping spots. This appropriation seeks to construct these camping spots so as to reduce the fire hazard, as well as to build up the recreational features of them. We have this great influx of annual visitors brought about through the improved highways that go through these forests, and we have not any place to take care of them. These tourists, hikers, campers, naturalists—a great many of them—go in there without any primary knowledge of good forestry, and as a result of their ignorance our forests are left to their mercy. These recreational features are worth a great deal to the forestry of this country. As the good roads have attracted millions of people to the national forests, the establishment of these recreational camps will naturally educate great numbers of tourists and health seekers in proper forest practice.

It is interesting to know that of the millions of dollars that have been given to the national parks, so far as I am advised an unremunerative enterprise to the Government, we have for the purpose of establishing recreational camp grounds in our national forests expended the puny sum in the last two years of \$25,000. The figures, as Mr. Greeley, chief forester, gives them, to put one of these camps in a proper condition with proper facilities and the proper requirements to make it the kind of camp ground we ought to have in these national forests, is based upon an estimate of 960 camps—I believe it was in the year 1922 from which they took the figures—and the estimate of these 960 camp grounds there were over 1,300,000 people who availed themselves of those camp grounds. The forestry people based an estimate of the requirements properly to handle these 1,360,000 people, that 2 cents per person could be expended in preparing these camps with proper facilities with reference to the starting of fires and sanitary conditions around the camps, and that as a result of this 2 cents of expenditure upon the people who went into these camp grounds in 1922 it would amount to \$122,000. In other words—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAGON. I ask unanimous consent to continue for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAGON. In other words, in these 960 camp grounds upon which the Forestry Bureau base their statistics, it requires \$122,000 in order properly to care for them. Now, it is perhaps a sad commentary upon our Government that these recreational camp grounds in the national forests of this country have been built up and sustained by civic organizations to a greater extent in the communities that surround our national forests. The Wichita Forest, in Oklahoma, which is one of the most attractive forests, has many recreational features built up and established by the industrious and enterprising people surrounding the forest. The same is true, if I am correctly advised, as to the Colorado recreational camp grounds. I say to you that the Government can not afford not to keep step with the enterprising civic organizations of the community that surround these national forests and for good reasons, so far as the Government is concerned. First, our national forests this year, if I am correctly advised—and I get the information from the Bureau of Forestry—our national forests brought in over \$5,300,000, and for administration and fire-prevention measures there was expended \$5,100,000. But the monetary value of our national forests is not the only thing. There is an educational value. As I pointed out in an address the other day the men of New England and the men of New York and the men of the Central States of this Union, are as much interested in the forests of Oregon and Washington and Arkansas and Louisiana as the people who live in those respective States. Why? Because every time you construct a frame building you take into consideration the forests of these Western and Southern States, and I say to you it behooves every man in the United States, with our lumber

supply rapidly diminishing and the price of lumber rapidly rising—it behooves everyone to take a particular interest in our forests, and we can not do anything better than to teach from your recreational camp grounds everyone of these men, women, and children who come into those grounds what a disastrous result can occur by leaving a smouldering fire in the camp grounds, and educate them in the primary principles of good forestry. The recreational value of our forests is great in the precaution which goes in the introduction of proper forest methods to the people who live outside the forests where the greatest amount of our timber products really is. Then it has another value.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] here has just called the attention of the House to the condition which exists, I believe, in Arizona. I want to say to you I believe the Arkansas forests, which are the largest in the South or East, could take care of every surplus deer we have in the State of Arizona. If I am properly informed, however, we can not handle them in the East and South because they are not properly acclimated.

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will yield, we think that could properly be handled if freight and express rates were not so high to bring them back.

Mr. RAGON. That is just one of the purposes I have in mind in introducing this amendment. If these deer can be raised and kept and maintained in the climates of Arkansas and Pisgah forests, North Carolina—if they are to be destroyed out there—why not let them go there or to the Ozarks forest, where we have not now 40 deer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. I am not opposed to recreation. Everybody knows the benefits that can be derived from proper recreation. But the Government is not in a position where it can create a recreational park system. This appropriation is not for such a purpose. I assume that this appropriation is more for the purpose of having some person representing the Government look generally after these forest camp grounds. The first appropriation was made in 1923, \$10,000. Then it was increased in 1924 to \$15,000, and last year we increased that amount to \$25,000.

The purpose of this appropriation, as I understand, is not, generally speaking, to prevent forest fires. There are other appropriations for that purpose carried in the bill. On page 35 is an appropriation of \$283,000. Further on in the bill, on page 70, we have a further appropriation under miscellaneous items of \$660,000.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there for a question?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Let me make my statement first. The gentleman had the floor and was not interrupted. When I get through I will be glad to yield. The gentleman states that at one of these parks there were a million visitors, and he estimates that at the rate of 2 cents each, or \$20,000, they probably could lay out a recreational park. With such sum, perhaps, they could provide an athletic field, a gymnasium, tennis courts, baseball and football grounds, and perhaps a complete system of sewerage. I do not know about that. It would all be extremely idealistic. There is no question about that. But up to date we have about 1,500 camp grounds in our national forests, and they are increasing all the while. If you take the case of the gentleman's camp ground as an illustration, and, of course, if you are going to provide these idealistic recreational features in one park, you would eventually have to provide them in all the others, instead of this service costing \$15,000 or \$20,000 per year it would cost annually \$30,000,000.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. RAGON. In this particular item the money is not for the prevention of forest fires generally, but in specific camp grounds. I have not any idea of one penny going into my State. I am interested in the matter in a general way.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman would not advocate what he contemplates in one park and then deny it in another park?

Mr. RAGON. Oh, no.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Then I will ask the gentleman if he is in favor of starting out on a program that will ultimately entail an annual expenditure of \$30,000,000?

Mr. RAGON. No; it would not take that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CRAMTON. The particular amendment is only for \$20,000. I hope no one is misled by that innocent amount. The program of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] seems to me to be based upon an erroneous conception of the relative fields of the national parks and the national forests. When he first presented this amendment to the House last Tuesday he said:

Notwithstanding the Government spent millions of dollars last year and will continue to spend for the proper maintenance of our national parks, which have only an educational value, with an incidental recreational value, yet we spent the small sum of \$15,000 for development of the recreational features of our national forests, which not only carry with them an educational, recreational, and a health value but also carry a monetary value to our Government.

It needs to be emphasized that the national forest system is primarily for the preservation of the forests and the forestry experiments, and not to provide recreation. Any recreation provided in our national forests is absolutely incidental, and we should not engage in a different program from that. There are many places where towns have contributed money to maintain what is practically a municipal park in a national forest. It is very proper that they should contribute money under those conditions. But when it comes to considering them—the great park system in this country—not only for education but for recreation, that is a different proposition. Of the thousands and thousands that now go into our national parks the great annual increase is from those who go in automobiles. They camp; they patronize the camps in those parks. It is a matter of recreation and health to them. That is not incidental; it is one of the main purposes of national parks.

I hope that whatever national parks we have in this country will be maintained as one park system, will be kept in one bureau and not scattered in half a dozen competing bureaus.

I am not going to argue the particular amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas in so far as it is incidental to the main idea of forestry, but I do dissent from the idea that these forests as the field of recreation do a greater and more valuable work than the national parks. He is putting the cart before the horse. I hope, therefore, the amendment will not pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of tree seed, cones, and nursery stock, for seeding and tree planting within national forests, and for experiments and investigations necessary for such seeding and tree planting, \$131,705: *Provided*, That from the nurseries on the Nebraska National Forest the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish young trees free, so far as they may be spared, to residents of the territory covered by "An act increasing the area of homesteads in a portion of Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904: *Provided further*, That additional land may be purchased at a total cost of not to exceed \$900 adjacent to the present Beal Nursery, in East Tawas, Mich.;

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly, grasshopper, alfalfa weevil, and the chinch bug, \$197,700;

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 45, line 15, after the word "bug," strike out "\$197,700" and insert "\$397,700."

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I understand a number of gentlemen on this side would like to discuss this amendment. I wonder if I can get an agreement with the chairman for 15 minutes to a side, 30 minutes on this amendment?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. What is the special purpose of the appropriation? Has it any particular purpose?

Mr. HUDSPETH. We ask for an appropriation so that we may destroy the grasshoppers that have been infesting the Southwest for a number of years.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to do what is fair and I will accept the proposition made by the gentleman from Texas of 15 minutes on a side.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is reasonable. Mr. Chairman, I want to consume but five minutes—

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Just a moment, please. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want five minutes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] give it to you?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; I will give the gentleman from Texas five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] is to control the time and will give me five minutes that will be all right.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Several gentlemen have asked for time on this side, because this is in the interest of the farmer.

Mr. BLANTON. This is a very important item in the bill and we ought to have some time on it.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman from Texas says he will give you five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House: I trust that the farmer Representative from Kansas [Mr. TINCHESTER] will not leave because, gentlemen, this is an amendment in the interest of the farmer, and those who are the friends of the farmer ought to vote for this amendment.

For the past several years, and especially last year, it has been estimated by the Agricultural Department that the grasshopper, which infested Texas very largely, destroyed 1,000,000 bales of cotton. I want to state to my friend from New York [Mr. MAGEE], who does not live in a cotton section, that he can estimate how much revenue was taken by this pest which infested the great Southwest. Why, gentlemen, in Kansas, in Texas, and I understand in Oklahoma, the grasshopper swooped down and did not leave even a leaf upon a tree and not a vestige of vegetation upon the ground; they not only destroyed crops throughout the West, but they destroyed the grass, and in many places the ranges were absolutely denuded of grass.

I have read the hearings with regard to the various subjects about which the committee held exhaustive hearings, and right here I want to state to my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], who is a farmer and who is the ranking Democrat on this side, that the bill carries \$368,000 for eradicating the corn borer. I take it you gentlemen throughout the Northwest, around Lake Erie and Lake Huron, are interested in the eradication of the corn borer, yet you give the measly sum of \$197,000 for the eradication of the grasshopper and other insects, and I do not find a single line in the hearings—and I am not criticizing the committee—relative to the destruction by the grasshopper. Every man in Texas and throughout the Southwest is familiar with the devastation of the grasshopper and how he has denuded the ranges and crops. Why, he will take every leaf off the corn, every leaf off a stalk of cotton, and leave the ground as bare as this floor. Yet I do not find, gentlemen, in these hearings where there was any information sought as to how this pest could be eradicated. It is not a new proposition; it has been going on for years, but last year it was more destructive than in any previous year, as far as my information goes. And I would like for my farmer friends from Oklahoma to give me their attention, because they are interested in this thing. I am talking for the farmer, and I want those who represent him to give heed, because he is interested.

We are only asking that a sufficient sum be allowed in this bill to eradicate the grasshopper. Every man who is familiar with the destruction of this pest knows how it swoops down from the north, across the plains of Kansas and Oklahoma, and destroys everything in its wake. If you will give the matter any consideration at all, I think you will appreciate the importance of raising this sum only \$200,000, so we can eradicate the grasshopper, and with sufficient funds it can be eradicated.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. President Coolidge tells us the trouble with the farmer now is that he is overproduced already. Does not the gentleman think that if that contention is true, it would be a good thing to save this appropriation and let the grasshoppers eat up what the farmer has?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the gentleman think that with cotton selling at 30 cents a pound and alfalfa hay selling at \$37 a ton throughout the West that the farmer is overproduced?

Mr. ROMJUE. No; I disagree with that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The old ranchmen out there would take serious issue with that statement when they are compelled to pay \$62 a ton for cottonseed cake to feed their cattle, because the grasshopper destroyed their grass in many instances.

Mr. ROMJUE. I totally disagree with the President.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I disagree with the President on that, although I agree with him on some things, but not on that.

Mr. ROMJUE. If that contention is true I think the farmer would be better off if we saved this appropriation and let the grasshopper eat up what he has.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not think the farmer is overproduced, and I do not think, when we get from 25 to 30 cents a pound for cotton, we are overproduced. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, this amendment is in the interest of the farmer and stock raiser and it ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, usually I back up the committee and the Budget in their estimates of expenses. It is rarely the case that I ever vote for an item of increase over the Budget. But the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] vitally affects a great portion of the State of Kansas, a great portion of the State of Oklahoma, a great portion of the States of Colorado and Arizona, as well as a great portion of the State of Texas.

I went through a part of the district of my colleague [Mr. JONES] this summer and saw orchards, 10 and 15 years old, with the bark stripped off of the trees by grasshoppers and the trees dead. I saw in his district crops of corn that were absolutely stripped to the stalk, not a vestige of anything left except the mere stalk, where it meant everything to the farmer and his family. I want to say it affects thousands and thousands of farmers through the destruction of their crops, which means the yearly income of the whole family. That being the case, I take it this amendment will meet with the serious consideration of this committee.

It is a menace which affects the production of the whole country. My colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] told you it meant the loss of \$1,000,000 of cotton in Texas; if it means that loss, it means a loss of wearing apparel to greater extent for the people of the country; it means an increase in the cost of production which must be borne by the consumers of the country; and in food products alone, I dare say, it means a loss of millions of dollars to the United States Government and its people each year.

Why should not this amendment be adopted? What part of the \$70,000,000 we have been spending annually in the name of agriculture is more important than this particular subject which deals with the entire year's income of whole families, thousands of them, scattered throughout many States?

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. What success have they met with in fighting these insects?

Mr. BLANTON. Very little within the practical reach of ordinary farmers. They have been spending, as I say, from \$50,000,000 to \$70,000,000 each year in the name of agriculture, and yet these expert scientists in this Bureau of Entomology have not yet discovered a means whereby the problem may be met successfully by the ordinary farmer.

The farmer plants his crop, he borrows the money to get his feed, he borrows the money to get his seed, and then he plants a crop. He is under contract in many instances to pay a large rental. His whole family helps him to prepare his land and to plant it. The crop comes up and he cultivates it. It gives promise of great production, and when the harvest is almost ready to begin the grasshoppers swoop down on him and leave him not a thing for his whole year's work. It is entirely too expensive for him to poison them. They come out of adjoining pastures in swarms. It is too late to cope with them then, for the proper solution is to find means to prevent them from being hatched out.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. REED of New York. Then this is for the purpose of studying the proposition to see if they can find some way of eradicating these insects?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; and for no other purpose. Not a dollar will be spent except in research work.

Mr. REED of New York. Have they met with any success so far?

Mr. BLANTON. Very little, substantially, for poisoning is too expensive. The people all over these States I have mentioned—Kansas, Oklahoma, Arizona, Colorado, Texas, and

other places—will write to the Secretary of Agriculture and say, "For God's sake, send us some relief," and he will answer them and say they have not the money and that Congress will not furnish it to them. This amendment will keep them from passing the buck.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if the \$100,000, by which amount they seek to increase this item, would do any good, there might be some grounds for advocating it; but the grasshopper problem is 50 years or more old. They have given it strict attention in the Department of Agriculture, year after year, with a yearly sum for research work to find remedies for the situation brought about by these grasshoppers. They have found a remedy and it has proven successful. My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] said he had looked all through the hearings and had found nothing in them about the grasshopper. There is no use repeating in each annual hearing problems that have been solved and problems that have been settled. Had the gentleman gone back one year or two years he would have found the grasshopper situation discussed. He would have found the remedy set out. He would have found where the department officials had taught them how to successfully apply the remedy.

Therefore this appropriation will do no good. We still carry an allotment of \$24,000 for research work to study this problem.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. The solution to which the gentleman refers is rather expensive when it is applied, is it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. JONES. I know that when they undertook to kill the grasshoppers in the quantities found out in certain sections of the Southwest this year it was rather expensive to follow the method which the department set out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let me read from the hearings of last year:

The method of control is using poison bran mash. This poison bran mash is prepared with white arsenic.

This is sown—it depending upon what particular district—at certain times in the day. In some districts it may be sown early in the morning, or perhaps not until 10 or 11 o'clock, while in other places it may be in the afternoon or evening. These are problems that have to be worked out by research, because the proper time for the distribution of this poison may vary in different localities.

The proper time depends upon when the grasshopper gets warm. In the morning, as soon as he gets warm, he commences to feed, and when he commences to feed is the proper time to distribute the bran mash.

Bran mash is not very expensive, and neither is white arsenic.

Mr. JONES. According to the hearings, though, the problem must be worked out further and the solution is not complete. According to the statement you have just given us, he says these are problems that have to be worked out by research. As I understand it, the solution they have already obtained is a very expensive one, and one that is not known as fully as it might be, and has not been worked out in perhaps as economical a way as it could be if they devoted more attention to it. I am not as familiar with it as I might be, but that is my understanding.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The department states in this hearing, "the cost would run from 25 to 30 cents an acre." Is that expensive? Of course, it would vary according as the price of bran mash might be a little higher or a little lower, or the price of white arsenic might be a little higher or a little lower, but I contend that 25 or 30 cents an acre to kill grasshoppers is a cheap remedy, and as cheap as any they will ever find.

Mr. JONES. The trouble is, that is the cost of one application, and one application will not do the work. It has to be applied from time to time. If one application would do the work that would be an inexpensive method, but as I understand it, the remedy which they suggest has to be applied time after time.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Do I understand my colleague to say that the Department of Agriculture has found that in the application of arsenic on a fiber plant such as cotton, it can be applied for 30 cents an acre?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to my colleague from Texas that this is poisoned bran and you scatter the bran where the grasshoppers are at about the time they feed, and they eat the bran and die from it.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I do not know so much about that proposition, but my colleague will realize that we have had some pretty expensive experiments down in Texas in the application of white arsenic to kill the pink boll worm and the boll weevil.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is calcium arsenate. I think the gentleman is mistaken about the remedy.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the committee will notice that this appropriation is only for making investigations for the purpose of finding causes and, if possible, remedies. That is why it is limited in amount. If it was for the purpose of applying a remedy, for doing the physical work and paying the expense of it, the amount would have to be very much larger. Gentlemen who ask for a large increase of this item evidently believe that if the appropriation were increased as they wish the Secretary of Agriculture would organize and carry on a campaign of extermination, and pay all the cost of it, to be waged against grasshoppers and similar plagues. No; the money in this item is altogether for investigation to find preventive or corrective methods of relieving the farms of grasshoppers. The fact is that each year for many years there has been an appropriation for this and similar work, and the Department of Agriculture, through its investigational force, has worked out remedies. The trouble is that some of the people for whose benefit they have been worked out refuse to apply them and wish money from the Federal Treasury for the employment of experts, laborers, and machines to go out and do the physical work necessary to apply those remedies.

In my judgment that is not a part of the duty of the Agricultural Department. It is not a duty which the Federal Government ought to perform. Investigational work ought to be pursued, and the Congress ought to furnish abundant money to enable the department to discover or work out remedies; but when remedies are found and their application requires only physical labor and effort, they ought to be applied by those for whose benefit the work is to be done.

Now, as was clearly and ably stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], a remedy has been worked out as far as possible by the department. It is well known and those whose crops are attacked or threatened should apply it. They should at least try to protect their own property.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. COLTON. Is it a fact that where the remedy has been applied it has been effective?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I believe it has been quite successful; very helpful, at least.

Mr. COLTON. I will say that in my own district we had a large number of crickets that invaded a part of my State. The people applied this same remedy that was recommended by the department which it had worked out, and it has been very effective in the last year or two.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I favor economy and, as a rule, am inclined to decrease rather than increase appropriation bills passed by the House. I am constrained, however, to favor the amendment offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH]. His district is about 700 miles from the one I represent, and yet the pest of grasshoppers mentioned by him and also spoken of by my other colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] penetrated my district during the present year.

This past summer, in company with my predecessor, Judge Rufus Hardy, I made a trip from Navarro County to Freestone County, and we witnessed the ravages of the grasshopper. On a number of farms it appeared as though an invading army had marched across the fields of cotton and corn and left them bare as the floor.

This is the first year that the grasshopper has been of any serious consequence in my section of the State, and it indicates that the pest, instead of being checked, is on the increase. The opponents of this amendment claim that the Government has already solved the problem of discovering a remedy, but if such has been discovered it must not be in a perfected state. If so, why does this bill make any appropriation whatever for the purpose of investigating means to destroy the grasshopper and other insects therein mentioned. This bill seems exceedingly generous in discovering means to eliminate other pests not known in the great Southwest. The sum of \$280,000 is provided for the investigation and prevention of the spread of the Japanese beetle; \$383,630 to prevent the spread of the corn borer; and \$740,000 to prevent the spread of moths. The increase in the appropriation proposed by my colleague's amendment is infinitesimally small when compared with the value of the crops sought to be protected. The sixth congressional district, which I have the honor to represent, produced in 1923 over 400,000 bales of cotton, and

the increase in the appropriation proposed by my colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] represents less than one-half of 1 per cent of the value of the cotton crop in that district alone.

The destruction wrought by the grasshopper in one county in my district during the present year is many times larger than the entire sum of money involved in this amendment. I trust it will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I regard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] as highly as any man on the floor. This is not a new question. The bill carries an appropriation of \$24,000 for research work to find a way to get rid of the grasshopper. To add to that appropriation money to conduct further research work would not in any way help the American farmer. The department has all the money it wants for that use. They have been investigating a way to get rid of the grasshopper for a good many years. They have a remedy. There is a plan you can use that will prevent the grasshopper from taking the crop.

The old question comes back. Will the Government administer the remedy or will it confine its activity to research work and finding the remedy? If we are going to administer the remedy, we would need two or three million dollars, because \$200,000 would not be a drop in the bucket.

In Kansas, where the grasshopper has been prevalent this year, our people have been spending from their own fund for years in fighting the pest. If the Government is going to make a fight in one locality, it should make the fight in other localities. I want to vote for everything for the farmer, but I do not want to be put in the foolish attitude of voting a lot of money for the department to conduct its investigation when I know that the department will not use it. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the question has been already solved successfully, why appropriate this amount that is included in the bill for the investigation of insects doing this damage?

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, no one claims that the last word on the question has been said. It is absolutely all right to continue the investigation, and I am not saying that I would not, if there is a real emergency, vote for an appropriation for the Government to make the fight; but that is the question. Men talk on this amendment as though, if you would increase the appropriation by \$200,000, Uncle Reuben, as you call him, could expect that that \$200,000 would be used in wiping out the grasshoppers in his fields, and nothing could be more deceptive to the American farmer than to pass an amendment with that representation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If, as my colleague from Texas has stated, you have an effective remedy now, why is the grasshopper increasing by millions each year and extending over a vast territory last year which it had not touched before?

Mr. TINCHER. All I say about the effective remedy is that we have an effective remedy whereby, if you spend enough money, you can eradicate the grasshopper from your fields. Such an occurrence as has been described—grasshoppers coming in in swarms—we have not had in Kansas since 1873. I did not know that they were visiting Texas in that way. However, I am not in favor of abolishing the research work and if \$24,000 is not enough I would vote to increase it. But, as a friend of the American farmer, I do not want to be put in the attitude of voting to increase this \$200,000 upon the theory that the money will be used to eradicate grasshoppers. I was on this committee for years, when we had hearings. It is an old question with some of us. You vote to appropriate money for research work, and they use so much as they want of it, and I understand that they have asked for only \$24,000, and that is perhaps all that they can successfully spend in conducting this investigation, and it will perhaps pay all of the men qualified to make the investigation that are now in the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman ought to know that every grasshopper that is in Texas now has a Kansas brand upon it. They all came from Kansas.

Mr. TINCHER. I am thankful for the fact that Kansas did not furnish Texas all her pests. There are other sorts of pests in Texas that did not come from Kansas. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUDSPETH) there were—ayes 34, noes 48.
So the amendment was rejected.
The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, \$255,440.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. For the benefit of those here who represent the cotton districts I rise to state that this is an increase in this appropriation of \$15,000; \$7,500 is for the eradication of the cotton flea and the other \$7,500 of this increase is to investigate what is known as the Arizona boll weevil. It is a new pest or a new species of boll weevil, although it belongs to the same family. This pest has fed for years upon the wild cotton that grows in the mountains of Arizona. It prospers and flourishes and multiplies in dry weather. That is where the danger lies. If it should gain entrance into the plains of Texas and other States where the old boll weevil does not affect the cotton on the high and dry lands, it would be very disastrous. If this pest should get an entrance into Texas from Tucson, Ariz., and then into Oklahoma and on over the Cotton Belt, you would have the old boll weevil that destroys the cotton in a wet year and you would have also a weevil that flourishes and destroys the cotton in a dry year. It is important to the people of the Cotton Belt that we take every step, quarantine and otherwise, to prevent the immigration of this dry-weather weevil into the Cotton Belt of Texas, Oklahoma, or any other States. Of course, it can not be handled. It seems as though this bug has even challenged the science and knowledge and ingenuity and intellect of man. I have always had an abiding faith that man's intellect could control any insect that ever existed upon the earth, but I am about convinced that even with the best scientific men in the world in our Bureau of Entomology that that one little insect is their superior and that it survives in spite of their ingenuity and poison.

I want at this point to read a little doggerel:

TWO KINDS OF BOLL WEEVILS

Boll weevils are two kinds
That live on cotton bolls;
Each feasts on what he finds—
Whether dry, wet, or cold.

The new bug is a hummer;
A kind of bug that's dry,
He lives his best in summer
When rain has passed him by.

That old boll-weevil bug
Feasts when the showers fall,
But when its dry the plug
Will never make a call.

Just as the weather man
Directs the sun and rain,
These bugs stick to a plan
And watch the weather vane.

Like old Jack Sprat and wife,
Who licked the platter clean,
These bugs sustain bug life—
The farmer's left between.

And thus the farmer's way
Toward the river Styx
Is pestered every day—
He's in "one hell of a fix."

Insects new and insects old;
Insects shrewd and insects bold;
Insects wet and insects dry;
Insects tame and insects shy;
Insects rough and insects tough—
God knows we've had insects enough.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of the Montana national bison range and other reservations and for the maintenance of game introduced into suitable localities on public lands, under supervision of the Biological Survey, including construction of fencing, wardens' quarters, shelters for animals, landings, roads, trails, bridges, ditches, telephone lines, rockwork, bulkheads, and other improvements necessary for the economical administration and protection of the reservations, and for the enforcement of section 84 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled

"An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," \$46,215: *Provided*, That \$2,500 may be used for the purchase, capture, and transportation of game for national reservations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDERSON: Page 50, line 11, after the words "United States," strike out the figures "\$46,215" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$58,215"; and at the end of the section, line 13, add the following: "*Provided further*, That \$12,000 may be used for the construction of a highway through Sullys Hill National Park, and in the construction thereof the Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey may cooperate with the Bureau of Public Roads."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to provide for the construction of a road through Sullys Hill National Park. The State of North Dakota, in cooperation with the Federal Government, has provided for the construction of a road between two county seats, Devils Lake and Minnewaukan. As this road is laid out it runs through the Sullys Hill National Park. The Federal Government could now provide \$6,000, or one-half of the sum necessary for the construction of this road, under the general road fund, but, obviously, as this is Federal land, the State can not provide the other half of the expenditure. Therefore this road stands in the position of having two ends and no middle, because the portion of road running directly through this park will not be improved under Federal or State funds and constitutes a link of unimproved road.

Now, as a matter of fact, while it is not possible of mathematical demonstration, the construction of this road through this park would represent a real economy. The road leads from the Narrows, a small station on the railroad to Fort Totten, on an Indian reservation, and practically all of the supplies on this reservation have to be hauled over this road, which ordinarily is in a very bad condition, and a very considerable saving would be made in the facility with which these supplies could be transported if the road is completely improved. But that is not the feature of it in which I am particularly interested. As a matter of fact, this national park conducted by the Biological Survey is the only thing of its kind in a stretch of many hundreds of miles, and to one who appreciates the great distances out there, who knows of the everlasting sameness of the landscape, it is easy enough to appreciate the recreational value of a park of this kind. The recreational facilities offered by this park are the only thing of the kind in this section of the country. Some 11,000 people visited there last year, part of the time under very great difficulties because of the poor character of road leading there. All this would do would be to apply to this park under the Biological Survey exactly the same policy pursued in the national parks and national forests. And I want to appeal to my friend from New York that if he will be good enough to accept this amendment it would be not only a recognition of its essential fairness, but an act of amity and grace.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the committee be authorized to change any and all totals to conform with amendments made by the committee during the consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the clerk will be authorized to change the totals as requested.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and other animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with rearing fur-bearing animals; for experiments, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, bobcats, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, jack rabbits, and other animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry and wild game; and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies in predatory wild animals, \$533,290.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 24, page 50, the figures "\$533,290" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$633,290."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAPES). The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 50, line 24, strike out "\$533,290" and insert "\$633,290."

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if you have the hearings before you and will turn to page 408 you will find that Mr. Henderson, in testifying before the subcommittee, stated that the appropriation—and it is the same this year as it was last year—to save the livestock growers and farmers of the United States from great losses from these pests should be \$662,000. That was brought out by a question propounded by my colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Now, this is one of the most important works inaugurated by the Department of Agriculture. The late and very much lamented Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, who now sleeps beneath his native soil in Iowa, requested of the Budget Committee the very sum that I am asking you to incorporate in this bill to-day, \$633,000. I am going to ask gentlemen, and particularly my friend from New York [Mr. MAGEE] and my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], this question: Who is in a better position to know of the work of the Biological Survey and the work done in eradicating these predatory animals—the prairie dog and other pests? Is it the Budget Committee or the Secretary of Agriculture? Is it the gentlemen down there who have it under their supervision or the chiefs of the Budget? I will ask you in all fairness who is in the better position to estimate the amount required for this important work? In a conversation I had with Secretary Wallace about a year ago he stated to me it was one of the most important of any of the works in his department.

What has been done, gentlemen? I am talking to you gentlemen of the Northwest. This does not affect my State. We have eradicated the wolf, except as it is replenished from the plains of New Mexico. What has it done? It has enhanced the value of every acre of grazing land in the West all the way from \$1 to \$10 an acre through governmental instrumentality.

You may say, "Why not let the ranchmen destroy their own wolves?" I answer, they do form clubs and they have paid bounties for the destruction of the coyotes and wolves. You gentlemen who have public lands, you gentlemen who represent the public-land States that are now affected, should be interested in this. I recently made a trip through the State of New Mexico with my friend the Representative from that State [Mr. MORROW], and I saw scalps of these predatory animals hung upon almost every barn. I want to say to the chairman of the committee that I understand that after a very exhaustive hearing on this matter you found that this was an important work.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We find that it is an important work, and I think we have made a very liberal appropriation for it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I disagree with the gentleman on that, because the gentleman's committee did not give the amount requested by the Secretary of Agriculture, \$633,000. I contend that the man who had the work under his immediate eye was in a better position than this Budget Bureau down here to judge of what was required to rid the country of predatory animals. It is not only predatory animals, but other pests as well. Throughout the West the prairie dog has been exterminated. He has been known to destroy whole sections of land, and the rat and other rodents are also destructive.

I say to you, gentlemen, in all seriousness that this appropriation should be voted because it is the same amount as that which Mr. Wallace, the late Secretary of Agriculture, after mature deliberation said should be incorporated in this bill. I sincerely trust that you gentlemen who are interested throughout the Northwest will state whether or not it has been a benefit to the livestock grower in your section in the last 10 years. Sheep throughout the United States have increased in number from 37,000,000 to 47,000,000, largely due to the fact that the predatory animals which preyed upon them have been eradicated.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have five requests for five minutes each and I want five minutes myself. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 32 minutes and that those Members who have indicated that they want time be permitted to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all

amendments thereto be limited to 32 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] is recognized.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Department of Agriculture is contemplating an increase in the fees to be charged grazers upon the forests which will approximate 75 per cent and in some cases 100 per cent.

Of course, personally I do not agree with that policy. I earnestly hope that the department will not put into effect this proposed increase in the fees. If that policy is carried out, it will work an additional hardship upon the stock growers of this country, and I am sure, speaking particularly of the cattle raisers, that they can not bear much more expense. But if the Government is to increase the fees, as is now contemplated by the department, surely it ought to help in so far as it is possible in eradicating the predatory animals which now infest these forests. But whether the grazing fees are increased or not, this good work should go on. As has been pointed out, it is conservatively estimated that the Government saved to the country over \$7,000,000 last year. This work is now progressing rapidly. In many sections of the country these animals have been eradicated. It has been shown that in many cases when left to the trapper locally the work is not done as well as it is done under the supervision of the Biological Survey. They send their trapper into a given section and try, as far as they can, to completely clear it of these predatory animals. They can profitably use more money. They have the men in the field. It is economy to continue the work with the force they now have and to increase it. They need this additional \$100,000. They will more than give it back, many times more, through a decrease in the number of animals killed. If their present plans are carried out and the grazing fees are increased—which I hope will not be done—then it is the duty of the Government to fight these pests. If we are going to require our stock raisers to pay an additional fee, amounting in some cases to 100 per cent increase, we ought to adopt a broader policy of making the ranges as safe as we possibly can.

Gentlemen, this means much to the stock growers of the West; it means much to those who have permits upon the forests of this country, and I feel it would be adopting a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy now, while the field force is at work, if we handicapped them and prevented them from clearing up these forests and grazing lands from the predatory animals. Let us finish the work as soon as we can and give the department every dollar it needs.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There is not a movement to curtail the service any further than it is now being carried on, is there?

Mr. COLTON. This item as it now stands will prevent the department from having the amount of money which it requested to do this work. Those who know best have asked for more. While they are doing such effective work, why limit them?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. But they will have as much as they had before.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; but they need more, and can effectively use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there are no Government trappers in my district, hence it is little affected by this amendment, but I happen to know that in several districts in the State of Texas, in that of Mr. GARNER, in that of Mr. WURZBACH, and in that of my colleague, Mr. HUDSPETH, this is a very much-needed appropriation. There are not only many coyotes there but there are many timber wolves still left there, which not only kill young calves but sometimes yearlings and colts. There are still some panthers and mountain lions left in parts of those districts and there are still some of these big catamounts left that prey upon flocks. They need some protection. I think it is money well spent along that line to increase this appropriation. As has been said, there was \$11,000,000 worth of property saved through the expenditure of the small sum that the Agricultural Department used last year. I think that is quite a return from throwing bread on the waters by Congress; quite a return for the Nation.

I am in hopes the committee will see fit not to fight this proposition. It does not mean anything to New York. There are not any timber wolves left up there. It does not mean anything to some of the other States, but to the States of New

Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Texas—to the cattlemen of those four States, at least—it means much, and while it affects my district very little, it affects vitally many other districts in the United States. I hope the extra money will be allowed.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not wish to appear in the position of being a looter of the Treasury when things come up that have to do with the western part of the United States. This is a matter, however, about which I have, I think, more than the ordinary amount of information. I was for a good many years in the Forest Service, being first a ranger and later having charge of some of the national forests of the West and cooperating in work of the nature provided for here. The work was carried on by the Biological Survey, but to some extent under the cooperation of the Forest Service.

There are certain things in connection with it which we ought to bear in mind. We learned during the war that very often after preliminary work leading up to the final stroke of attack it was necessary to mass forces to take a position and thus finish the thing, while if we held back we were likely to lose an advantage already gained. Here is an exactly similar situation. I could tell you personally, if I had the time, of different places in my State of Montana and the West where great progress has already been made, where the work has been brought up to the point where, if there can be a more intensive drive covering the next few years, the predatory animals can be put out of existence.

Mr. Chairman, the West is full of instances in which predatory animal extermination has been brought up to a certain point through the offering of bounties by the stockmen themselves, and then because of a slump in the cattle business or otherwise they found it impossible to continue to pay these bounties, so that they stopped the work or slacked up on it. When they have done that, even for a year or two, the predatory animals make back as an increase in a year or two all that has been gained against them over a period of 5 or 10 years.

The Secretary of Agriculture, who has recently passed away, asked for more money than is put in this bill in order that the work already done might be consolidated and that the final stroke might be delivered to bring an end to this problem.

It would be a matter of economy to the United States to add the \$100,000 being asked for now rather than let the work extend over a greater period of years.

Something has been said to the effect that the stockmen themselves might be able to finish this work on their own initiative. The man who goes out as a private trapper finds it to his advantage, as you will readily see, to leave the young of the wolves and other animals so that there will be something for him to trap again the next year. His interest is not in entirely wiping out these predatory animals. But when the Government trapper is sent in he gets his salary and he does not get any more or less if he does a fine job of it than he does if he does a partial job, but his reputation with his department is that he gets great results. As a result of that spirit I could tell you personally of places in the West where these animals have been pretty well eradicated by Government trappers.

As has been said, predatory animals largely originate on the public lands and in the national forests, so that it is a national duty to help meet the situation adequately until they have been eliminated.

Keep in mind that the elimination of one old wolf saves to the stockmen an average of \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year. It is known that that much damage will be done by an average one of these old wolves. Thus we are doing something here, I repeat, which will be of national importance while we have great areas of public lands until the work is done. We are doing something not only to carry on our stock business but to build up the western country. I hope this amendment will prevail.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, recently I was out in the Bad Lands in South Dakota, nearly all of which to-day constitute and has constituted Government land, and while standing upon the brink of the prairie and looking over into the Bad Lands I saw not less than six coyotes making their way out of a small wooded ravine some 75 or 100 feet below me. In our State we have made large appropriations out of the State treasury for the eradication of predatory animals, and are working in cooperation with the trappers in the Agricultural Department who are there doing this work, and the stockmen of our State have also made very large subscriptions toward a fund having for its purpose the eradication of these predatory animals.

Thousands of dollars worth of damage is being done out in my State every year by coyotes, wildcats, and wolves in the killing of sheep and young cattle. One big gray wolf alone

during the last four or five years is known to have committed damage to the extent of more than \$10,000. A Government trapper got him early last fall.

We have hundreds of thousands of acres of public and of national forest lands in South Dakota. These public lands and national forests are the breeding grounds of the predatory animals in our State, and I believe the additional appropriation asked for ought to be granted at this time. If this service can be prosecuted as vigorously as it has been during the past two or three years we can very largely rid our State of these animals in the next three or four years, provided the Government will do its part in killing off the destructive animals that are now rapidly multiplying on the public domain.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the gentleman make that last statement, that if this service can be followed up for the next three or four years, just as it has been conducted in the past, this problem can be solved. I hope the gentleman is right, and that is exactly what this committee is trying to do—to follow up the service as it has been conducted, giving the same amount of appropriation from year to year, keeping the same perfected organization as a going concern, and doing efficient work.

Two years ago the Bureau of the Budget cut this appropriation \$30,000. Your subcommittee put it back at just what it had been before. A year ago the Budget Bureau again cut the appropriation and your subcommittee put it back to just what it was. For what purpose? To keep the efficient organization this bureau now has operating as it has operated in the past.

What are the facts? The gentleman talks about traps. Traps have practically been abandoned by the department as impracticable and too expensive. But what have they done? They have rendered a great service. They have discovered a poison or have made a poison that is tasteless. For years wolves would not eat poisoned meat because it was bitter, but now they have discovered a process by which you can poison meat with strychnine and make it tasteless, and the wolves readily eat this meat. Therefore the Government has performed its function in evolving an efficient remedy which the citizens of the country can avail themselves of.

There is nothing complicated about putting out poisoned meat. There is nothing complicated about poison so long as you get the proper brand of poison from the Government, and they can do that. So that it strikes me that if each individual ranchman would conduct a systematic poisoning campaign and have his ranch hands, who are familiar with his ranch, and who are familiar with the resorts of the wolves and other predatory animals, put out this poison at such places, they can do a thousand times more good than the 250 men that the bureau has in the field all the time.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. There are no ranches in the national forests, and the national forests are the breeding grounds of these predatory animals.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I concede that in the national forests the Government should kill out the predatory animals of its own accord and at its own expense, and we have ample money for that purpose. We can not kill them all in one year or two years. We have plenty of money to buy the poison, and we have 250 men scattered throughout these Western States to put out this poison, and they are succeeding admirably. The department states right here in the hearings that the wolves have been practically eliminated. Where they used to go in droves they can hardly find one, and that in many sections coyotes have practically been cleaned out. In other sections that is not true. But as they decrease the number of these animals you want to increase the appropriation. It looks to me as though a decrease of the animals ought to call for a decrease in the appropriation, or certainly not an increase in the appropriation.

This work was commenced in 1916 with an initial appropriation of \$134,825 for that year. This year we have increased the appropriation until they have \$283,993 for this work. That is sufficient. Oh, what has become of the self-reliance, the individual initiative, of the American pioneer? The Government has evolved an efficient remedy by which you can kill these wolves by the thousand. They estimate that last year they killed 100,000 coyotes by poison alone. What has become of the initiative and individual freedom of action of men in protecting their own property and attending to their own business? Are they coming to the point where they are relying upon the Federal Government to hire men and send them out there to trap animals on their private ranch lands? On the

Government land we are carrying sufficient funds to meet this situation. Let the private ranchmen protect their own interests after the Government furnishes them a proper remedy. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is never particularly a satisfying or gracious experience to oppose an amendment increasing an appropriation where good work is being done. The committee recognizes that the work done under this item is very efficiently done and that it is a very valuable piece of work. That fact has been demonstrated not by words but by acts. In the last 10 years the appropriation in the aggregate has been increased from \$110,000 to something over \$500,000. It is a very clear demonstration of the fact that the committee has approved of the work that has been done for the last few years as efficient work that should be continued. The only question now is whether the work shall be continued on the basis on which it has proceeded so satisfactorily for the last few years or whether the time has come when we ought to increase the work. In view of the great progress that has been made, the large number of animals that have been killed, it seems to me we ought to be satisfied to continue the work on the basis that it has proceeded upon for the last two or three years. It has been argued that because the Secretary of Agriculture proposes an increase of \$100,000 in this appropriation that that ought to prevail with the House in determining the amount appropriated. If we were to proceed on that theory, if we were to appropriate in the bill the amount estimated by the various heads of the bureaus in the Department of Agriculture, we should add not \$100,000 but \$4,500,000.

The fact of the matter is what you have here is the judgment of the Budget officer, the judgment of the subcommittee that considered the bill, that the amount here proposed is adequate for the purposes for which it is proposed. As I said, there is no particular satisfaction in opposing an increase of an appropriation under which good work is being done, but if we are to preserve a reasonable proportion between this work and other work done by the department we ought to appropriate the amount recommended by the subcommittee. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to some facts bearing on the paragraph wherein we have appropriated all that the Director of the Budget recommended. In this bill we appropriate \$533,200.

The first appropriation made under this paragraph was in 1912, \$35,000. The sums appropriated for the various years since that time are as follows:

1913	-----	\$43,000
1914	-----	60,000
1915	-----	110,000
1916	-----	280,000
1917	-----	400,540
1918	-----	395,540
1919	-----	394,820
1920	-----	464,440
1921	-----	456,040
1922	-----	477,240
1923	-----	502,240
1924	-----	502,240
1925	-----	508,880

What has been the result? As stated by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] the result obtained by the Department of Agriculture has been very satisfactory. Here is a question which I put to Mr. Henderson, a representative of the department, at the hearings:

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Do the depredations of these animals appear to be decreasing?

Mr. HENDERSON. With respect to the wolves and the mountain lions, there can be little doubt but that that is true. We have reduced the numbers of these larger predatory animals, and in some sections wolves are no longer seen where they used to run in packs, and mountain lions are getting scarcer. Their numbers have been reduced in some regions until they are no longer a serious source of damage. Then coyotes, however, are very abundant in the West. They have very large litters, and they have acquired the ability of taking care of themselves in spite of civilization. They have even extended their range into the eastern part of the country as far as Indiana, Michigan, and, I think, some places in Ohio. We have been able in many parts of the country, where we have been working, to reduce the damage, so that, where the damage to the livestock used to be very serious, it is now quite negligible.

Now you practically get down to the question of eliminating the rodents. When you undertake to destroy the coyotes and all the rats and squirrels of different species, rodents of every name and nature, that is a proposition entirely beyond the province or power of the Government.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman has had his time and I have only a few minutes. The one idea I wish to convey to the committee is that when you get to rodents the communities and localities infested must take some of the responsibility in their elimination. The Government, if it is going into that business, as suggested by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] would need an appropriation of millions. I think that it is high time that this rapid pace toward paternalism should stop and that we ought to conduct business along business lines. We ought to ask the communities and localities affected to cooperate with the Government. Let them expend some of their money in protection of their own private and individual interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired, and the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUDSPETH) there were 27 ayes and 54 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For biological investigations, including the relations, habits, geographic distribution, and migration of animals and plants, and the preparation of maps of the life zones, \$29,455.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I read this bill there are about \$48,000,000 appropriated for the Department of Agriculture outside of the amount appropriated for roads.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think \$44,200,000.

Mr. JONES. Then let us say \$44,000,000. The Department of Agriculture has done some very fine work, but as a matter of fact nearly everything in this bill strikes at the problem of production. That is not the real problem that confronts agriculture to-day. It has been said over and over again, until it has become almost trite, that the real problem of the farmer is that of distribution, and I believe that as between the two things it would be wiser if we took the entire \$44,000,000 and turned it over to the Agricultural Department with instructions to organize some clearing houses in the centers of population for the purpose of getting the producer and the consumer closer together. I do not know that it would be wise to abolish the things that the Department of Agriculture is doing now, but I do believe that as between the two the far more important thing would be to have a route established around the present method of distributing the products as between the producer and the consumer. I received a letter from a man in Texas in which he told me a few years ago that there was the finest potato crop in his vicinity that he had ever known, that the potatoes were literally there by carloads, that there was no market for them, and that they could not be sold. A local merchant said that there had not been a call for potatoes for a month. I went down the street in Washington and the retailers were selling them at that time at 32 cents for a quarter of a peck, or nearly \$5 per bushel.

Of course, it is of some service to have these pests killed, to have things known that are in the interest of production, but as a matter of fact I think it would be better to have the Agricultural Department so organized that it could, through methods of standardization or some similar means, put in touch the consumer and the producer. I do not believe it would be necessary to have the department go into business. I do not believe it would be necessary to have that department handle many, and perhaps not any, of the products of the farm; but if there were a short cut established by which those who produce, or organizations of those who produce, could get in direct touch when necessary with those who consume, or organizations of those who consume, the products it would act as a check to keep these middlemen in line. I believe if you would take the \$44,000,000, or even \$25,000,000, and establish in various centers of the country marketing agencies for the purpose of getting in touch the producing organizations with the ultimate purchasers furnishing market news, it would be more nearly a proper governmental activity than most of the things colated in this bill. In this way we would do much more to advance the real interests of agriculture, because if the producers of this country could secure a reasonable portion of the prices which the consumer is now paying, agriculture would be on a much more profitable basis than it is to-day.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNYDER). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], who comes from a producing district, has seen fit to take into consideration the conditions in the consuming districts. It is rather discouraging

to housekeepers and the tenement dwellers in my district to read cheerful reports from the Department of Agriculture or to hear that crops are plentiful and that food is abundant, and then when they go marketing in the morning to buy food for their families for the day to find prices so prohibitive that people are unable to give their families proper and sufficient nourishment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is not very cheerful to them when they have to pay 55 cents a pound for round steak to learn that I sell my beef for 4 cents a pound.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Just think of it; and we do not get much steak for 55 cents per pound; it costs nearer about 30 or 75 cents.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is not very cheerful for them to know that fact.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No; I should say not. New York City is now building large terminal markets. The cornerstone for a large market in the Bronx district was laid a short time ago. We will also have an enormous terminal market in Brooklyn and one also in Manhattan. These markets will have enormous floor space, storage and refrigerating facilities, and intended for wholesale and retail marketing. If your farmers or your organizations of farmers will take advantage of New York City's terminal markets before the middlemen and speculators get all of the space and monopolize the benefit of those markets, we will be able to establish in one city of the country at least a direct communication between the producer in the rural districts and the consumers in the city of New York. The trouble is in the channels of communication and the many parasitical middlemen between the farmer and the consumer. For instance, you ship to New York to a middleman onions from Texas or potatoes from some other State, or other perishable goods.

They permit those goods to remain in the cars for a day or two in hot weather and then telegraph that they are compelled to sell them because they are deteriorating. Very often they are sold to themselves for a price not sufficient to pay the freight rates. If you can arrange through your cooperative organizations to have space in our new terminal markets, costing millions of dollars, with storage facilities of all kinds, cold and otherwise, it will go a long way toward doing away with the difficulties now confronting us. Under the agricultural laws of our State a farmer shipping into the State is guaranteed his payment, because every commission merchant is under bond, and that law is working out nicely.

Mr. BLANTON. In order to help out the farmers, the merchants of Pauls Valley, Okla., recently pledged the citizens to buy a few turkeys each at 15 cents a pound. Would not the gentleman's constituency in New York like to have some of them at that price?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We would like to have turkeys, but in New York we could not have them running around in our tenement houses. However, we can take all of the turkeys you can send us for 15 cents a pound, if you can only get them there. I hope you gentlemen who have real agricultural problems will look into our market situation in New York, and I am sure Mayor Hylan and the Board of Estimates of New York City will cooperate with you. I was on the board of estimates when we first appropriated for and approved the plan for these terminal markets, and the purpose was to establish this direct contact. You will have the facilities there, you will have the space there, and any time any of the cooperative organizations are ready to confer with the city authorities, I am sure the mayor, Mr. Hylan, will meet you more than half way.

I believe the plans adopted by my city will work out to our fullest expectation. If your farm organizations or cooperatives will give our plan some study and consideration, I feel certain we have something real in our New York City project.

But let us start now, before the space is taken by the speculating middleman, and establish a direct contact between the agricultural centers and the consuming centers.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations for the welfare, improvement, and increase of the reindeer industry in Alaska, including the erection of necessary buildings and other structures and cooperation with the Bureau of Education, and for the enforcement of section 1956 of the Revised Statutes as amended so far as it relates to the protection of land fur-bearing animals in Alaska,

including necessary investigations in connection therewith, and for carrying into effect the act entitled "An act for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1908, as amended by the act approved June 7, 1924 (Pub. Res. 34, 68th Cong.), \$85,095.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the membership of the committee to the importance of passing some character of bill to give either the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior the right to allot or lease pasture land in Alaska. As it now stands neither department has any right to lease any land. The reindeer business or the breeding of reindeer has grown enormously in Alaska. The climate suits them, the pasture suits them, and a vast private enterprise has developed there in the raising of reindeer. They are being shipped in enormous quantities to the United States and used as beef, but the Government can receive no rental from any pasture or forest land in Alaska. Not only that, the stockmen themselves engaged in this business do not know what to depend upon. They can not get a lease, and they know not how long they will be permitted to graze there, and it is to the Government's interest, and to the interest of the industry of Alaska and this country, that this Congress pass some bill authorizing some conditions under which leases may be made.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. How much of that sort of land is there in Alaska?

Mr. BUCHANAN. A great portion of Alaska. That same statement applies to fur-bearing animals. These people who engage in that industry and who are occupying a piece of land ought to have the right to know how long they will be permitted to occupy it so as to know whether their investment will be justified by the length of time they will be permitted to use the land. I just wanted to call the attention of the committee to that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend the remarks I made on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing of farm and non-manufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm products throughout the world, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing of farm and food products, and for investigation of the economic costs of retail marketing of meat and meat products, \$539,107.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last line for the purpose of asking my friend who is in charge of the bill for some information. I suppose the gentleman has followed the reading of the bill. We are on page 58, the paragraph at the head of the page. The appropriation in that paragraph is \$539,107. I wish to ascertain why the appropriation for the coming fiscal year is less than the appropriation for the present fiscal year. The appropriation for the present fiscal year is \$550,988.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is a decrease made by the Director of the Budget, as I understand it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That being the case, I offer the following amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Virginia. On page 58, line 14, strike out the figures \$539,107 and insert in lieu thereof \$550,988.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph relates to the subject of acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing, and so forth, of farm and manufactured food products. It is generally recognized that this service and the similar service provided a little further on, have proved of very great and growing value, and although the reduction is not large it seems to me that it should not be made. A reduction to any extent will operate to discourage the work that is going on in the States which are cooperating with the Federal Government.

If a reduction, however small, is made, there will be more difficulty in addition to that which is already being experienced by some of the States in doing what they are doing in the interest of the farmers. Again, while I am not a critic of the Bureau of the Budget, having voted for the budget system, I do not believe in the policy of horizontal or arbitrary reductions. I think a reduction ought to be made when there is a reason for it, but where there is no reason for it there is false economy in making it. That should not be the practice. Some of us have been endeavoring to ascertain why this particular appropriation should be cut down to the extent of about \$12,000. If I am to vote for this bill, and of course I shall vote for it, I must cast my vote in the dark so far as this item is concerned, and I do not think that is a course that should be expected of Members of the House of Representatives in the discharge of the obligations resting upon them. I have looked in vain through the hearings for any word from anybody to justify the action that the committee has taken, and in the absence of any information I submit respectfully to my friend from New York and to his colleagues—and I want to get the attention as far as I can of the Members of the House who represent agricultural districts—that we ought at least to maintain the appropriation at the same amount that was appropriated when provision was made for the needs of the Agricultural Department during the present fiscal year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Just before I yield, Mr. Chairman, I would like permission to couple with my remarks an extract from a letter from the chief of the bureau of markets of my own State and a very brief newspaper clipping which accompanied the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extract from the letter follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,
DIVISION OF MARKETS,
Richmond, Va., December 9, 1924.

Hon. R. WALTON MOORE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: The market news on agricultural products has been carried on cooperatively by the United States Department of Agriculture through the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Division of Markets of the Virginia State Department of Agriculture for a little more than a year.

Attached is a copy of our report for to-day and a clipping from to-day's Richmond Times-Dispatch, carrying yesterday's report and editorial comment on our market news service, which shows how it is being used by that paper. It is now being printed by practically every other large morning paper in the State regularly, either in full or in part, and many of the smaller papers and some evening papers are printing part of it.

We are supplying agricultural teachers with this information, which they are using to great advantage in their classrooms, and we have supplied telegraphic service of several hundred words to shippers who have paid all expense of same.

Because of a reduction in the amount received by the United States Department of Agriculture for market news service during the present fiscal year we were called upon last July to assume an additional amount of the expense of this service, although we had been paying about half the cost, and we are now putting all the money into this we can afford to from State funds.

I am informed by good authority that the present Budget before Congress of the Department of Agriculture provides for a reduction in the amount for market news service of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of about \$10,000. If this reduction is made it will probably seriously cripple the service we have just gotten well started, and which meets not only the approval but the demand of farmers, agricultural leaders, the press, and many consumers of our State. In fact the Federal department considered curtailing the service in the South for a few months in the fall when the reduction was made last year, but I frankly told them that if the curtailment were made at the period suggested by them, which is our busiest marketing season—but which might easily be done for some other Southern States—we did not feel that the service should continue periodically.

Very truly yours,

J. H. MEER, Director Division of Markets.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The following is an extract from an editorial by Richmond Maury, agricultural editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch:

The State division of markets, cooperating with the Federal department, are giving to the farmers of the State a real service in their daily market news report. This report contains the prices for the day on various markets of the country on products that are of interest to Virginia and South. The service was started in August, 1923, and carries this information throughout the South by leased wires.

At present the State division sends this list daily to 486 addresses, having recently, for economy, reduced the list from 793 persons. In addition to all of the papers of the State, the market report is sent to those persons who can make the most use of it. By means of the papers, this daily market information as collected by an uninterested agency is carried to the producers of the State.

Difficulties in the Federal Budget for 1924 threatened the discontinuance of this service for a part of the year to the southern farmers. Through close cooperation on the part of the State the gap was filled. The Budget for 1925 is now coming under consideration. Means should be provided in the appropriations for the Federal Government to carry its portion of the expense for the full continuance of this service to the South. The service has been developing slowly; it was something new and its worth is just becoming fully appreciated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This appropriation provides, among other things, for the publication of information as to the economic cost of retail marketing of meat and meat products. Has the gentleman's experience been that we have had any benefit from this source along those lines?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I can not detail what have been the activities of the Department of Agriculture in that direction. I would like to see something done in the direction indicated by the gentleman. I listened with interest to the remarks the gentleman made earlier in the day with reference to the willingness of the authorities of New York to furnish market space to those who are trying to reduce the city prices to consumers. I would like to ask the gentleman whether if a State should apply to the authorities in New York for space to carry on such work it would be furnished? A Member told me the other day that a State itself was contemplating an effort to supervise the final marketing of some of its perishable products.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think the authorities of the State of New York would be only too willing to cooperate and do that very thing.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the members of the committee that this is an actual decrease from the appropriation for the year 1925, and is largely due to a reduction of \$8,123 in the attempt on the part of the Government to reduce the personnel in the department. We hear in the House frequent criticisms to the effect that there are so many employees in these different departments that one can hardly get around; that they are so numerous they are falling over each other. The officials of the Budget are endeavoring to reduce the personnel in this department to the extent of probably two or three or perhaps five. It will not affect the efficiency of the work. This important work will be carried on with the same effectiveness as heretofore.

I do not care a copper cent whether the House restores this item or not. If our Democratic friends want to go on record as saying that when we attempt to reduce the personnel of the department they will try to put it back, on them will be the responsibility.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman please tell us what the department asked for on this item?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I only know what the Budget Bureau recommended.

Mr. WATKINS. Have they cut it?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. It is cut only about \$8,000 in reducing the personnel of the department. That reduction is in harmony with the idea you will find carried out in other paragraphs of the bill, an attempt on the part of the Director of the Budget to reduce the number of employees in the various departments.

Mr. WATKINS. The gentleman does not know, however, what the department asked for this particular item?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman means what the Department of Agriculture requested?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand from the hearings that the Department of Agriculture asked for what they got last year. We do not get anything very explicit in the hearings.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Oh, yes, we do. I will refer the gentleman to the hearings on page 498. I read:

Mr. MAGEE. Now, can we go back to this item, which we passed over, Doctor—marketing and distributing of farm products, 1923, appropriation \$549,628, and this year \$539,107, an apparent decrease of \$10,521. How much increase is due to classification?

Miss CLARK. \$1,360.

Mr. MAGEE. So that you have an actual decrease?

Miss CLARK. An actual decrease of \$11,881.

Mr. MAGEE. How does this amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$321,606, compare with what you are spending now?

Miss CLARK. It is \$8,123 less than we are spending now.

I do not know how to make it clearer.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is certainly not a very clarifying statement. From what was said a while ago I understood that \$1,000 of this proposed reduction would be on account of salaries, but beyond that there is a reduction of eight or nine or ten thousand dollars in the item.

The gentleman from New York says he does not care a copper what is done with it. Does not the gentleman think it better to encourage the great work of assisting the farmers in this important matter of marketing their products than to cut down the appropriation and to that extent discourage the work?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. There is no question as to the merit of this paragraph. Everybody agrees to that. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia on this proposition, so that the gentleman from Virginia is not talking to anyone who disagrees with him. The result here is obtained by reducing the number of employees in the department. If he is not in favor of that reduction, I have no objection; but I simply want the House to know what the bone of contention is.

Mr. LANHAM. There is to be no curtailment of the activities?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. No. The idea is just to get rid of a few unnecessary employees. If you are in favor of not reducing the personnel we can not help it. I think the number of employees ought to be reduced in all the departments of the Government. We have made an honest effort to do it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I want to say to my friend that I am not making any unfriendly attack upon the bill.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not complain of anything that the gentleman from Virginia has said. I only say that I have no contention with the gentleman on the merit of this work. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I was only explaining how this reduction came about.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to refer to what the gentleman said awhile ago of the Democrats taking responsibility for increases in appropriations that are proposed. As to that, when we come to consider matters of this kind and any matter which relates generally to the success of the administration of the Government, I for one lay aside partisanship and endeavor simply to do what seems to me my duty as a Representative.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Members of the House will understand that this bill carries, as to every bureau, a limitation on the amount that can be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

That limitation runs all through the bill and results in a saving in departmental service of over \$100,000.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think materially above that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The estimate showed \$110,000, but we gave them a little leeway in each bureau and made up for the \$10,000. The estimate showed a saving of \$110,000. In this one bureau that cut in the personal services in the District of Columbia saves \$8,123, so that by subtracting that \$8,123 from \$11,881 you leave this item on its merit decreased \$3,758.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I may say to my friend that I can not contest his arithmetic, but that he leaves me, even assuming the correctness of his figures, at a loss to determine why the Bureau of the Budget should have made a cut of between \$3,000 and \$4,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to the gentleman that the Bureau of the Budget has been guilty of that practice in many paragraphs throughout this bill; and this committee, whenever it noticed them, generally or sometimes overrode that practice, because we do not believe in making a little cut and disorganizing a well-organized and efficient service. So far as I am concerned, if the gentleman will vote to make his amendment \$3,758, I will vote for it, so it will leave the department exactly as it is; otherwise I would vote against it, because it is wrong to reduce the personnel in one department in the interest of economy and not reduce it in other departments where it can be reduced and ought to be reduced.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The testimony discloses this:

How much increase is due to classification?

Miss CLARK. \$1,360.

Mr. MAGEE. So that you have an actual decrease.

Miss CLARK. An actual decrease of \$11,881.

Mr. MAGEE. How does this amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$321,606, compare with what you are spending now?

Miss CLARK. It is \$8,123 less than we are spending now.

Eight thousand one hundred and twenty-three dollars plus \$1,360 amounts to \$9,480 instead of \$11,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman should keep in mind that the reference is to an actual decrease and excludes the classification.

Mr. WATKINS. Then the classification decrease will be the difference between \$11,881 and \$9,480?

Mr. BUCHANAN. When reference is made to the actual decrease it means it has been decreased that much, and not counting the classification.

Mr. WATKINS. What I am trying to get is what is due to a decrease in the personnel here.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Only \$8,123 is due to the personnel, and they have actually decreased the appropriation on its merits \$3,758, so that if you want to put it back where it was and not decrease the departmental service the amount should be \$3,758.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to what this paragraph really has in it and what we may expect if this policy is to be followed up. The great address made by the President of the United States in Chicago a few days ago contained no more important feature than that in which he gave emphasis to the matter of extending the markets of the farmers of the country. In going over this whole bill I find that here is practically the only paragraph and the only language which has any connection with the development of foreign markets. Now, if we indicate what we propose to do with reference to the markets of the world by the language that is carried here, it seems to me our policy is hardly in line with the suggestions offered in that splendid address. If it is to be a policy merely of cutting down the employees in the District for the purpose of saving money, I have no quarrel with it. I do want to express my disapproval of decreasing the appropriations made for extending our foreign markets for farm crops. I do not believe either the President or the country desires our work in extending our markets of either agricultural or industrial products curtailed. Here is one place where the flat percentage plan of reduction suggested by the Budget should not be carried out. We ought not to pass this item without having our attention called to the oversight we are making with respect to one very important feature of our great farm-marketing problem, and I have simply risen to call that to the attention of the committee.

Mr. WASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman know that the amount carried in this bill is identical with the President's signed Budget to Congress with respect to this particular item?

Mr. KETCHAM. My understanding is that there is a decrease of a few thousand dollars, the principal decrease being in the amounts provided for employees in the District.

Mr. WASON. This is the exact amount of the Budget.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We have not cut it at all. We have acted in accordance with the direction of the Budget.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I say this? I am finding fault with making the horizontal cut apply to this very important item in this bill. There is not a more important one in the whole bill than this, and here we are quibbling over a few thousand dollars in connection with it.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. KETCHAM. Certainly.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. You were talking about the suggestion which the President has made. We have done what the President has directed. That is the only point I am making.

Mr. KETCHAM. Has the gentleman any means of knowing whether the same policy is to be followed in connection with the subcommittee having in charge the appropriation for the Department of Commerce?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not know anything about the work of that subcommittee, because I am not a member of it.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. JONES. I might suggest that maybe they are trying to save enough money to build another battleship to sink.

Mr. KETCHAM. Of course that is facetious and is immaterial to this matter.

At the same time, I do insist, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that we are passing over a most important item in this bill with a lack of appreciation of the value of this great feature of the work of the Department of Agriculture. I most heartily approve of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Virginia, making the amount equal to that being expended this year for actual field work in extending our foreign markets for farm products.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Gentlemen of the committee, we have been reading a good deal in the papers recently, and there has been a good deal of agitation with reference to what is to be done for the betterment of agriculture. I ask the indulgence of the House for making a few observations. This I deem the proper place in the bill.

In so far as providing credit I think every student of the economic problems of the farmers must agree that that need has been pretty well taken care of. Besides while proper credit is necessary, its value, what may be expected therefrom, has been much misunderstood, much overestimated. In so far as the marketing of those commodities with regard to which the farmer produces a large exportable surplus and what determines the general price, I believe that every student of these problems will agree that Mr. Dawes has told the truth. And, by the way, there may have been other important Republican officeholders and politicians who have told the growers who produce soft wheat and the meat growers the truth with regard to what determines their price, but I do not know who they are. He is the only one I know of. I congratulate him. When he said that the domestic price of commodities, of which the farmers produce a considerable exportable surplus, is determined by the price received in the free markets of the world, he told the truth about it.

We come then to this phase of the agriculture problem—the sale and distribution end of agriculture, which is practically the only place, if we are to maintain the existing tariff policy, and it seems we are to do it, where anything can be done for the farmers. That is all there is to it.

Of course, production and preservation of soil fertility are important and never will be overlooked, but the nerve center of agriculture is not located there. I congratulate the President on having arrived at the point where the nerve center of agriculture is located—at the sale and distribution end of agriculture. I congratulate him and the country on that fact. He says there is the place to get results.

In order to induce the farmers of this country properly to preserve their soil and properly to take care of production, it must be made profitable to the farmer to do it. Make two blades of grass worth more than one was, and it will not be so hard to induce farmers to adopt methods which will have that result and preserve the fertility of the soil while they are doing it.

I believe, too, that every student of the economic problems of the farmer will agree that, aside from the assistance which he can get from cooperative marketing associations, we must bring about a condition under which it will be made possible to deal in agricultural commodities on paper. In order to do this they must be standardized, so that they can be bought and sold by their descriptive trade terms. It seems to me clearly a fact that we must bring about a condition under which agricultural commodities will move under prior sale from the point of first or secondary concentration to the point of need in response to the requirement for need. This never will be possible until we standardize agricultural commodities with reference to the requirement for need.

I criticize the present method of standardization. It does not have the right objective. We have a system of standardization intended to meet the requirements of the merchant. We must continue to develop our system of standardization until each considerable quantity of a commodity possessing distinctive characteristics that are determinative of the use to which it is best adapted shall have a trade term of its own, so that it can be bought under that trade term by those who want exactly that grade and quality for a specific use.

We need in America not only this system of standardization, but we need our system of standardization, our warehousing system, our Departments of Agriculture, Federal and State, and our cooperative marketing associations so organized as to make it possible for a man down in the Rio Grande Valley, for instance, in my country, or a group of people who have a marketing unit of a given agricultural commodity, while it is still in the Rio Grande, to put it in trading contact with the general market. In order to do this, of course, there must be a spot produce exchange, a place where these actual commodities may be actually listed for sale and sold by their descriptive grade terms. There is not a thing which I have suggested which has not been proven by actual test to be sound except their coordination. That has not been done. That is the only sensible objective, and it seems to me the only way we have a chance materially to reduce this spread between the producer and the consumer we have heard so much about.

The idea of sending these perishable articles abroad in the land to find a market, sending them into concentration centers and holding them there under refrigeration at great expense and then shipping them back, frequently over the same route they have come, is entirely wrong. We have had commissions and investigations and reports and speeches galore, charts by the mile, and the same old set of threadbare figures over and over showing spreads, and so forth. The thing to do is to attack this spread where it is located. One way to reduce freight charges is to move these commodities under prior sale from the point of production to the point of use. That will stop congested markets at one place and inadequate supply at another. That will afford the merchant a chance to reach the primary market and at the same time will give to consumers and producers a route around the private controlled avenues of distribution by which they can establish trade contact with each other. That is a better safeguard against unnecessary intervening profits than would be any legislative prohibition. That would tend strongly to hold the total of intervening profits to the basis of economic value of the service rendered. I can not discuss this phase further. I want to illustrate what I think can be done. It is my opinion, if I may be pardoned for expressing an opinion, that the time ought not to be far distant when a man who has a feeding pen of standard-bred cattle will be able, while those cattle are still in the feeding pen, to put them in trading contact with the markets of the world to sell them by grade. When that is so then we will have reached the point that we all desire to reach; namely, the point where the farmer when he comes to sell his commodity will have an equal trade advantage with the man who buys.

When he ships his cattle in to the stockyards where they are held at high expense—maintenance, shrinkage, and so forth—he has got to sell soon at whatever price will be offered. That is true with reference to the other agricultural commodities. I would like to discuss some other phases of this general subject. The working out of what I have suggested will be difficult, of course. It is a big thing, one not easily accomplished, but we ought to come in off of these cold trails and tackle the job. I know it can be done.

Of course, I can not discuss this big subject in this brief time, which is now expired. I ask the privilege of extending my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], I offer a further amendment to the paragraph of the bill under consideration which is designed to substitute for the figures in the bill, which are \$539,107, the sum of \$542,865, which, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has stated, seems to be the amount that ought to appear in the bill unless there is to be an arbitrary reduction.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I will accept the suggestion of my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moore of Virginia: On page 58, line 14, strike out the figures "\$539,107" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$542,865."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, stock, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooperation with the extension service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, \$472,910: *Provided*, That \$65,360 shall be available for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, including the purchase of such books and periodicals as may be necessary in connection with this work: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intentions of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I noticed a statement in one of the New York papers the other day by a Mr. Callander, who, it seems, has charge of the estimates of cotton production, in which he rather advocated the deferring of making any estimate of cotton production until August 1 or August 15. Did he appear before the committee and make suggestions along that line?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Callander appeared before the committee, but I suggest that the gentleman from Texas put his question to his colleague Mr. BUCHANAN, who is a cotton expert.

Mr. JONES. Under the law that exists at the present time the reports begin the 1st of July and are published every two weeks thereafter through the cotton-producing season. Of course, any estimates made before the time that the crop matures are in a great measure matters of conjecture, because the pests that frequently infest the cotton have not yet gotten in their full work. I notice that Mr. Callander made a speech before some cotton organization in New York, in which he said it was the opinion of the department that no estimate should be made before the 1st or probably the 15th of August; that at that time it would become apparent how well the cotton was going to mature and develop. I assumed that he was going to suggest to the Committee on Agriculture that it was unnecessary to make any estimate until that time. He did not say he was going to do so, however.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That question did not come before the committee; if it had, I would not have agreed with it.

Mr. JONES. He, as I am informed, is the man who has charge of giving out the data and final estimates. He is reported to have made this speech in which he advocated doing away with the estimates because of the fact that up to that time it was largely guesswork. In justice to him I will state that he did not take that position absolutely, but, rather, left the impression that that was his idea.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not altogether guesswork; they have the acreage and they give the condition of the cotton week after week and month after month. Of course, as the gentleman says, it may be destroyed by pests at any time.

Mr. JONES. According to his statement it becomes more apparent about the middle of August and the estimates are more reliable. I am not quoting Mr. Callander but I am giving it in substance as it appeared in the paper. Here is the idea they seem to have: Frequently in July and August the conditions give promise of making a much larger crop than they do about the time the crop matures. The estimates therefore are likely to be larger, and this is just prior to the time when the cotton is to be put on the market, just as the cotton begins to come into the market. Then if the estimates are large, the price will likely start at a lower basis than it would if they waited and gave the estimates later.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As a matter of fact, it might be just the reverse.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, was it not just the reverse this year; was not the estimate in July less than that in August?

Mr. JONES. There have been cotton estimates for nine years, and in seven of those years there has been an overestimate of more than a million bales. In nearly every month of the seven years there was an overestimate. I know, for I put the figures in the Record last year and I secured them from the Agricultural Department. In seven out of the nine years prior to the present year there has been an overestimate and frequently as high as 1,000,000 bales. Now, I confess—I do not know whether the prodding they were given in the committee and the panning in the House and the criticism throughout the country had any effect, but they have been much more accurate this year than formerly.

They have a very difficult task to perform, and I am sure they are improving their method of making estimates from year to year. It is perhaps natural that a good many mistakes would be made the first few years. At any rate, I feel sure that their system at the present time enables them to be more accurate than they were able to be the first few years.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If the gentleman from Texas will refer to page 487 of the hearings he will find where Mr. Callander made this statement:

The situation is this: We do not make an estimate of the acreage of cotton until the 1st of July. It is not the acreage planted. We estimate the acreage in cultivation. There is usually 1 to 3 per cent of the acreage planted, and sometimes a great deal more, which is plowed up and abandoned by the 1st of July. That is discounted. That is not included in the estimate of acreage in cultivation. Then, in order to avoid overestimating in the early part of the season, until some line on what is likely to be abandoned is obtained, which is usually not very much until later in the season, an allowance is made in making our forecasts for acreage abandonment. If in Texas, for example, acreage abandonment is 3 or 4 per cent, or whatever it is, that is allowed for in the early forecast.

Mr. JONES. That has to do largely with the cotton acreage. They also make an estimate of the number of bales of production, beginning July 1. While they use the acreage report in arriving at the estimate for production, they are two entirely different things.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$709,748.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, since I became a Member of this great legislative body I have to the full extent of my limited ability endeavored to secure legislative action that would, at least to some extent, insure to the agricultural classes equality of opportunity and the social and economic justice so long denied them. I have repeatedly called attention to the alarming condition of American agriculture and I have endeavored to show, and I believe I have conclu-

sively shown, that the economic distress through which agriculture has been passing, and from which it has not yet emerged, is not primarily chargeable to the farmers themselves, but is largely the result of legislative favoritism and an abuse of power and privilege by those who arbitrarily and selfishly control the economic forces of the Nation.

It is not my purpose to discuss in detail the concrete cause of the present nation-wide agricultural anemia further than to say that for several years the American farmer has not been able to sell his commodities at a price that would even return the cost of production, much less afford a profit. The purchasing power of the farmer's dollar is very substantially impaired. There is an alarming and unjustifiable spread between the price at which the farmer sells his commodities and the price he pays for his supplies, and this spread is constantly increasing, to the serious economic injury of agriculture. Indeed, for a number of years the farmer has annually faced a deficit and has been living off of the earnings and accumulations of former years. This encroachment on the farmer's capital stock can not continue indefinitely without irreparable injury to the farmer; and, may I say in passing, the shrinkage in the agricultural wealth of the United States in the last four years has been so stupendous that it is difficult to comprehend how agriculture has been able to stand the economic strain to which it has been subjected.

Unfortunately the farmer has ceased to be a factor in the legislative affairs of the Nation. Other vocational groups easily succeed in impressing their demands and will on Congress and the administration, and as a necessary result, practically all the economic legislation in the last half century has had for its object the enrichment of the manufacturing and commercial groups, obviously at the expense of the agricultural classes. No comprehensive and well-considered legislative program for safeguarding the vital interests of agriculture has ever been enacted. Such legislation as has been enacted for the improvement of agricultural conditions has been tardily and grudgingly granted, and has manifestly been fragmentary and incomplete.

Now, in view of the fact that other favored occupational groups control the legislative and economic forces of the Nation, is it not time for the farmers to "stop, look, and listen," and devise plans by which they may be insured equality of opportunity?

In numerous other addresses I have discussed the condition of agriculture, its needs, its proper relation to other vocations, its claims on the Government, and the duty and necessity of the manufacturing and commercial classes giving agriculture a square deal, and permitting it to enjoy a reasonable share of our national prosperity. I have heretofore discussed the aid that should be afforded by the Government and other external agencies. But to-day, prompted by a desire to be helpful, I shall, in the limited time at my command, suggest some things the farmers can and must do for themselves to improve their economic condition.

Farmers must reach an agreement on great economic policies, the recognition and application of which are conditions precedent to the revival and permanent well-being of agriculture. Obviously the selection of these policies require mature consideration. We must analyze existing conditions in the light of past experience and future probabilities. The agricultural brain must function more efficiently, and the agricultural will must express itself more forcibly and definitely before we can hope for substantial relief from present unfavorable conditions.

There is a profound philosophy underlying the profitable activities of the agricultural classes. The farmer must work in harmony with sound economic principles, if he would reap richly where he has sown, and gather largely where he has scattered. We can not defy or ignore the fundamental principles that permeate and vitalize every other successful and profitable calling. We can not run counter to the safe and sane business policies that are the price of success in other vocations.

In the present agrarian emergency, conditions demand the abandonment of slipshod farming and financial methods, a radical reduction in overhead expenses, rigid economy, and intelligent and efficient management. Unless brain is mixed with brawn, the balance at the end of the year will be on the wrong side of the ledger. Farming is as much a business as manufacturing, commerce, and transportation, and there is the same necessity for the use of prudent business methods in farming, and in farm finance, as in these other great occupations.

The farmer's objective is to establish his calling permanently on a profit-producing basis, which can only be attained by the abatement of legislative favoritism and removal of economic

handicaps and by patient industry, intelligent personal supervision, and painstaking attention to details.

The farmer can not conduct his affairs slovenly, extravagantly, or profligately and escape insolvency. He must see to it that the income from his farm exceeds the outgo, and he should never lose sight of the basic truth that he has failed or at least is economically slipping unless the year's business shows a profit. While the present nation-wide agricultural distress is largely the result of pernicious economic policies over which the farmer has had no control and for which he is not primarily responsible, nevertheless very frequently much of the trouble is traceable to unbusinesslike methods, neglect, inattention to details, excessive and unnecessary overhead expense, and, in some instances, to extravagance, speculation, and reckless disregard of safe and sane business methods.

Agriculture is the most important single industry in America, and therefore if it is to be made a profitable calling we should not only draft the keenest intellect in the world of agriculture but the best brain power of the Nation should be requisitioned to aid in formulating methods and establishing benevolent policies by which agriculture may function efficiently and profitably and be established on a stable and permanent basis. We must therefore apply the acid test of reason and common sense to the myriad plans and policies that now bewilder and confuse. We must separate the practical and wholesome from the impracticable and vicious. In the crucible of sound logic and in the blast furnace of reason the economic gold must be separated from the economic dross. We must subject every proposal, every business plan, every suggested remedy to the test of logic, reason, and common sense, for only by so doing can we determine what policies will best promote the welfare of the agricultural classes.

The farmer should adopt a bill of rights declaratory of principles and policies that will insure for agriculture equality of opportunity. We need an agricultural magna charta that will curtail the power and limit the greed of profiteers, abate monopoly, restrain industrial and commercial buccaneers, and prevent a wrongful invasion of the economic rights of those who produce the food that satisfies the hunger of mankind. There must be a recognition of the principle that there can be no worth-while, nation-wide, or permanent prosperity unless agriculture shares in that prosperity. All other vocations must concede the necessity of agriculture being permanently placed in the list of profitable occupations. This agrarian bill of rights, this agricultural magna charta, must be formulated along broad and comprehensive lines and should enunciate well-established economic principles and demand the recognition and concrete application of those outstanding economic policies, on the inexorable operation of which the permanent prosperity of the agricultural classes largely depends. These policies should not be bent and twisted in an effort to make them applicable to every conceivable condition or to furnish a remedy for every imaginary abuse or to protect one from the inevitable consequences of his own folly; but they should embody workable principles, from the just and rational application of which improved conditions may reasonably be expected.

Much of the farmers' trouble results from their failure to act in concert. There is a deplorable lack of unity—an absence of centripetal force that draws, unites, anneals, and solidifies. In the past there has been but little agreement among farmers as to what economic policies will best promote and conserve their interests. The agricultural classes do not always speak the same language, advocate the same policies, or support the same legislative program. Frequently we have ignored simple business principles and immutable economic laws. Ofttimes we have failed to distinguish between cause and coincidence. Even now in this protracted period of agricultural anemia, the farmers, farm organizations, and farm papers are not agreed on the remedies that will afford agriculture either temporary or permanent relief.

In unity there is strength; in division there is discord, weakness, and failure. So long as the farmers of the United States are divided into numerous opposing and contending factions, making war on each other, they can not hope to accomplish anything. Group rivalries, factional undertows, and antagonistic organization cross currents will neutralize their altruistic activities and render impossible the attainment of their legislative and economic objectives. The need of the hour is for unity in our agricultural faith and creed; unity of purpose, unity in principles, and unity in efforts and action. This unity must be real, not merely nominal. It must be more than a rope of sand; something more than lip service or voice loyalty. Farmers must no longer divide into warring factions, but should present a united front, support the same legislative and

economic program, and stand foursquare for policies bottomed on reason, and which appeal to the intelligence and sober judgment of our thoughtful, level-headed, forward-looking farm leaders. They should establish and adhere more rigidly to a definite agricultural creed and confession of economic faith. They must learn to differentiate between good policies and bad policies; between wholesome and practical remedies and visionary and impractical experiments. They need a definite formula or standard, by which to determine the effect of legislative and economic policies on agriculture.

There should be an end to the unseemly rivalry, bickerings, and contention that have divided the agricultural classes into hostile groups and neutralized the energies of the millions constituting the most numerous and important single class of workers in the world. Reason requires that we get together and coordinate our energies and efforts.

The agriculturalists should be as thoroughly organized as the industrial, commercial, and professional classes. The world does not always know what the farmer thinks, what he needs, or what he demands, because, too often, those who speak for the farmers do not speak the same language, give the same diagnosis of agricultural conditions, agree on economic or legislative policies, or accurately reflect the will of the agricultural classes.

Farmers can not secure substantial results or win a worthwhile victory in their present divided condition. Agriculture must have one mind, and one mind only on economic and legislative policies. It must close up its ranks and end the internecine war that has neutralized its influence and rendered its efforts impotent. Without this unity it can not come into its own, or attain a position of vocational dignity and influence.

The farmer suffers not only from lack of organization but he is the victim of organization, reorganization, and disorganization. We have too many organizations assuming to speak and act for the farmer which speak in an unknown tongue and often fail to reflect the farmer's will or protect his interests. Disclaiming any intention to criticize any of these organizations or to disparage their accomplishments or to discuss their merits or demerits, I nevertheless make bold to say that too often the wholesome purpose of these several groups is sacrificed on the sharp edge of envy, jealousy, group rivalry, self-aggrandizement, and, may I say, at times inefficiency. So far as I know all of the many farm organizations are founded on wholesome principles, have altruistic aims, and are designed to promote the good of the agricultural classes, but these organizations have been multiplied unnecessarily. The rivalry between these different farm groups is so pronounced that they are often exceedingly hostile toward each other, thereby neutralizing their influence and making it practically impossible for any of them to accomplish substantial results. Seldom do they feature the same policies or advocate the same legislative or economic program. Ofttimes when they should be united and actively cooperating they are at cross purposes, strenuously combating the plans, policies, and proposals of each other. Each pretends to speak for agriculture, but each represents only a part of a divided house; and a house divided against itself shall not stand.

Congress, in doubt, inquires what do you farmers want? What economic program do you favor? What legislative relief do you demand? To these inquiries frequently the rival farm organizations give no harmonious and clear-cut response. Each offers its own legislative program as a panacea for all agricultural ills and opposes the policies of rival farm organizations. During the recent session of Congress there was more unity and cooperation between the national organizations than usually prevails, but even then they did not speak as with one voice.

Now, something is radically wrong when the great farm organizations are unable to agree upon an economic or legislative program; when, instead of cooperating with one another, they spend their energies in undermining the influence of rival organizations. I am making no charge against any particular farm group, but commending all for the good they have done; nevertheless, it is obvious that we have many more farm organizations than are really necessary to work the will of and to efficiently serve the agricultural classes. Indeed, these farm organizations have become so numerous that they actually get in the way of one another, which makes it extremely difficult for even the best of them to function efficiently.

It would not be so bad if all these farm organizations supported the same economic policies and advocated the same legislative program.

Let us hope that by absorption, union, amalgamation, or by some other fair process many of these rival farm organizations may be eliminated, so we may have only a very few

national bodies to speak and act for the agricultural classes and to interpret and reflect their will. Without such a centralization and unity agriculture can not make its power felt in the never-ending struggle for equal opportunity and economic independence and vocational stability.

The agricultural classes must be actuated and inspired by a militant loyalty and devotion to the best interests of this great basic industry. Farmers should not forget that an injury to one is the concern of all; that what will promote the interests of one farm group will not injuriously affect another farm group; that in unity strength will be found for the grave tasks of the hour; that division and lack of cooperation spell disaster. This cooperation must be more than skin deep. There must be a willingness, if need be, to suffer a little temporary loss in order to establish helpful economic policies, strengthen their organization, and get in a better position to protect our interests in the future.

Too long have the farmers acted on the old adage, "Every fellow for himself and the devil take the hindmost." As a result, and because of this lack of cooperation, the profiteers, monopolists, and special-privilege groups, by sapping its substance, have brought agriculture dangerously close to bankruptcy.

The solution of the agricultural problem is both external and internal. The relief must come from within and without. There are numerous factors in this complicated equation, some of which are under the control of the farmers themselves and some are controlled by the Government and some by the special-privilege classes. The handicaps resulting from legislative discrimination must be lifted. "Big business" must give agriculture a square deal. The manufacturing and commercial classes must cease to exploit and ravish agriculture. The farmer must have a living price for his commodities and a voice in the conference at which the business and economic activities of the Nation are determined. But if all these remedies should be provided much would still remain to be done by the farmers themselves before agriculture would be securely anchored in the lists of profitable occupations.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNITED STATES WAREHOUSE ACT

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States warehouse act, including the payment of such rent outside of the District of Columbia and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$205,060.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 17, strike out the figures "\$205,060" and insert in lieu thereof "\$215,060."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, as will be observed, this adds \$10,000 to the appropriation carried in the bill. The warehouse act has proven to be one of the most valuable pieces of legislation that has been enacted in the interest of American farmers in recent years. Already many public bonded warehouses have come into existence. The cooperative associations among the farmers are just beginning to learn the value of the utilization of these bonded warehouses. This law has done more to stimulate the cooperative movement among the farmers themselves than any other thing that Congress has ever done.

At the present time the receipts issued by the warehouses are printed on specially prepared paper approved by the Department of Agriculture and printed by a bonded printer. The warehouse receipts issued as evidence of stored farm products are everywhere accepted as the best class of security by the banks, and the local banks have no difficulty in discounting this character of paper with the Federal reserve and rural-credit banks. As a result of the favor in which these warehouse receipts are held as security, the cooperatives of our State have been able to borrow all necessary funds for the carrying on of their legitimate business in handling such farm products as are now warehoused, but under present conditions it is impossible in our State to secure the warehousing of alfalfa seed. In South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Montana the production of alfalfa seed has gotten to be an important industry, running into hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Alfalfa seed to-day is sold largely through cooperatives in our State, but we have been unable to take advantage of the warehousing act because the appropriation is so limited that it has been impossible to organize a sufficient personnel to take care of alfalfa seed under the warehousing act.

I have been in conference with the department officials in regard to this matter, and am informed that if there were added to the appropriation the sum of \$10,000 they would be able to add alfalfa seed to the products now being warehoused. With \$10,000 additional the situation in our State and the surrounding States could be properly taken care of.

This is one of the most important items in the bill and I believe the additional \$10,000 ought to be allowed in the interest of the midwestern farmers. It is a small amount, but it seems to be absolutely necessary in order to give the service we need in connection with our cooperatives that are handling alfalfa seed. I hope the committee will approve this amendment. It is asking but a small favor and should be graciously extended.

The cooperative marketing movement among our midwestern farmers is just in its infancy. It is a movement in the right direction and ought to be given every possible encouragement. Wisely managed, it will prove to be the real solution of the farm problem. Every facility should be offered the cooperatives to store grains and seeds in these bonded warehouses, and the least that this Congress can grant is to allow a sufficient appropriation to enable the Department of Agriculture to provide the necessary storage facilities, manned with a sufficient personnel to care for such products as may be offered for storage. Ample warehouse facilities will largely solve the problem of adequately financing our local cooperatives.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, the apparent increase in this item over the year 1925 is \$18,560. Of this amount \$10,560 is for the classification of field employees. An actual increase of \$8,000 is to provide for the rapidly increasing volume of work due to the large number of warehouses which are being licensed under the warehouse act. The number of warehousing products, cotton, grain, wool, and tobacco, has been extended to include corn, potatoes, and peanuts, and preliminary work has been done on beans and dried fruit.

I do not feel competent to say whether this list should be extended to include alfalfa. Probably many Members of the House are more competent to speak on that proposition than myself. The warehouse act is an important act. We recognize that, and we gave the department, apparently, what they wanted. We gave them this increase, as I have said, because of the increasing number of warehouses that are being licensed under the act. I have risen simply to put before the members of the committee the facts as we got them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPLETION OF WOOL WORK

To enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, \$11,290, and to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The bill under consideration is one that confers broad powers upon the Secretary of Agriculture, and justly so. As a matter of State pride, I think that it is not amiss at this time to call to the attention of this committee the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Howard M. Gore, is a West Virginian.

There will be a new Secretary of Agriculture after March 4 next. The fine administrative ability of Mr. Gore, recently given substantial recognition by the President of the United States in placing him at the head of this great Department of Agriculture, has been recognized in a greater measure by the people of West Virginia, who have called Mr. Gore to be governor of that State for a four-year period, beginning on the same day that his commission as Secretary of Agriculture is handed back to the President.

For the third time in the history of West Virginia she has been honored by a place in the President's Cabinet, and her place in the sun has been more firmly established. In the higher call of Mr. Gore to the governorship, I feel that the country as a whole loses the services of a splendid administrative officer and that West Virginia is the gainer thereby. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. If my amendment should prevail, this would save \$11,290. There was a time right after the war when this wool section bureau was necessary, but that time is past now.

What is the use of longer keeping up this business? If you would investigate, you will find that every dollar of this money pays salaries of individuals, continuing them on the pay roll, on and on. I do not see any necessity for keeping on paying for war work that ought to be over. If it is not wound up now, when is it going to be wound up? I do not care to take any further time, but I hope that the committee will let it go out. It is not doing the woolgrowers any good in my section or down in the section of my colleague Mr. HUDSPETH, and it is not doing the woolgrowers of New Mexico or anywhere else any good that I know of.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, we fought out this proposition pretty completely, as gentlemen will remember, at the last session of Congress. The work ought to be completed, and I had hoped that the work would be completed during the fiscal year 1925. The Department of Agriculture claims that it has done all that it can possibly do, and I think it has. That department gave us the inference that the delay was due to the Department of Justice. There are a great many important suits pending, involving large amounts of money. The House, of course, can not force the Department of Justice to go ahead, push these cases, and get a final determination in the courts as soon as possible.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. But I think the department ought to press these suits, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. I want to get the facts before the members of the committee. The Government started in and collected a lot of money from the little fellows, so called, who bought the wool. The total amount collected to date is \$752,930.20. Of that the Government has distributed \$450,235.07. There is approximately \$220,000 in the Treasury which has not been distributed, because the Government does not know to whom to distribute it, neither the names of the persons nor the addresses of those to whom these moneys belong. These moneys eventually will go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, as well as a part of the additional amounts that may be collected. There are claims in the amount of \$724,000 outstanding, and the Government claims that those moneys are owed by a few persons, the large dealers. The question we have to determine now is whether the Government, having pursued persistently the little fellows, will quit on the big fellows. I am not in favor of that policy.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman will remember a year ago when this appropriation was before the House I had something to say in opposition to the appropriation. Now, at the time, I am not certain the gentleman made a definite statement, but somebody handling this bill before the House left me under the impression that there would have to be a decided showing that progress was being made by the department toward winding up this work or the appropriation would be eliminated this year. Now, the gentleman says they have \$220,000 in the Treasury belonging to somebody, but nobody knows their names, nobody knows the addresses of those who are entitled to that sum, and eventually it will go into the Treasury. I want to submit to the gentleman that if we continue to appropriate \$11,000 a year to pay a few salaries in the Agricultural Department that sum of \$220,000 is going to rapidly diminish.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I want to say that I do not concur in that statement, because the more money the Government collects the more money will go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me—I am sure the House will give him more time if he wants it—I understand that, as the gentleman says, the money was collected off the little fellows. Now, the big fellow, the man who owed a larger amount, has refused, the department's demands for payment, and it is necessary to bring suit. I understand that those suits have been brought and are now in the hands or under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Except one.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why is it necessary to maintain exactly the same force, maintain them to sit down and fold their hands in the Agricultural Department, drawing salaries, and so forth, awaiting the disposition of these lawsuits which may drag along for several years?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. They are not doing that. They have their work to do, and the employees in the Department, of Agriculture who have prepared the cases are the only ones who know the facts. They have to prepare the cases and ascertain the witnesses who can be called upon in the trial of those cases. You can not get along without them, and even if this appropriation is not made, I understand that

these persons will still continue in the employment of the Department of Agriculture. I feel exactly about this proposition, so far as winding it up is concerned, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I do not know what I said a year ago, but I certainly felt as the gentleman expresses himself now. If the gentleman will examine the hearings he will see that I questioned pretty sharply the representatives of the Department of Agriculture who came before the committee. You will find from the hearings that the Department of Agriculture took the position that this paragraph should be continued, and that if it was dropped probably those cases now pending to collect from these big fellows, as they call them, involving some seven hundred thousand dollars, would be dropped. That was the idea expressed by the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. The appropriation is \$11,280. I want to ask the gentleman a question. What about the expenditure in the District of Columbia, that there shall be spent not over \$8,600? That is on page 554 of the hearings. Why is the appropriation larger than the law allows it to spend? I think it should not be over \$8,600 anyway.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The sum of \$8,600 is what they are expending for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. I understand that is the limit, as your statement implies, beyond which they can not spend.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. No; printing and some other clerical work makes up the difference.

Mr. WATKINS. The difference between \$11,280 and \$8,600?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. I am not criticizing the Department of Justice. I do not know how the House can force the Department of Justice to speed up these cases. All I can do, particularly in view of the existing situation, is to explain what the Government has done in these cases. I think that the Department of Justice ought to take up these cases and push them to a conclusion as speedily as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not mean to intimate that our action here in dropping these few clerks off the pay roll of the Agricultural Department would affect the action of the Department of Justice in these cases? The department will carry on these cases just the same?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is what they say will happen. If you will read the hearings you will see that.

Mr. BLANTON. The Department of Justice is in a bad position if it is interfered with by the fate of these few clerks.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is what appears in the hearings.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman know, from what we have heard, that the collection of this money would not have been accomplished except for the work of the Department of Agriculture in collecting the information?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Exactly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I find that in the last few months collections have gone on. An amount considerably in excess of this sum of \$11,000 has been collected.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia that in the last year they have distributed a very considerable amount, which I would like to put in the Record. The hearings show that during the year \$57,000 has been distributed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF FOREST-PLANTING STOCK

For cooperation with the various States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants in estab-

lishing windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots upon denuded or nonforested lands within such cooperating States, under the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924, \$50,000, of which amount not to exceed \$2,650 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address some inquiries to the chairman of the committee on the subject of the appropriations on page 70, line 1, and continuing on page 71, just read.

I want to say that I think this is an important undertaking. I have traveled a good many times throughout the States lying between the Capital of the Nation and the State of Kansas, where I live—not as early in my life as I desired, but finally—and I have observed the beautiful wood lots in the State of Indiana and in that "Irish State of Ohio," and I have seen with what great care they have been kept and preserved. It is to me a very interesting subject. Then I have come along here and ridden through the States of Virginia and Pennsylvania and some others of the seaboard States, and I have seen a great waste in timber, thousands of trees lying prone upon the earth. And incidentally it made me think of a remark which a boyhood friend made at one time, to the effect that there were only two things that he hated to do—one was to work and the other was to chop wood. [Laughter.] It seems to me that antipathy is somewhat widely diffused.

But seriously, I would like to ask the chairman what it is proposed to do with this money. I note with some surprise that only \$2,650, in the first item, is to be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia. That seems ridiculously out of proportion, according to my way of thinking, as compared with the other appropriations carried in this bill.

In the second item only \$2,600 can be expended in the District of Columbia. I wonder if the chairman, as a matter of information to this House, could tell the House, especially Members like myself, who are so much interested in this subject and who live in States where there is not so much natural timber, how it is proposed to advance this work. Can the chairman do that? I regret that I have not had time to examine the hearings.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I could not attempt to do that, but I will simply say to the gentleman that we are trying to carry out the provisions of the act of June 7, 1924, known as the McNary-Clark Reforestation Act. No appropriations have been made under that act heretofore. What those who are to carry out the act propose to do, I do not know. We have given the sums recommended by the Budget to supply what is needed to carry out the provisions of the act passed last June.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Well, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to see the same beautiful, well-kept wood lots in the State of Kansas that I see in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois. We can not have them in a day. I suppose it was only a full-grown tree to which some writer referred, apostrophizing those eminent qualities that render human life vigorous and strong, when he said that such and such a man was built like a forest tree, the broad oak, that strikes its roots deeply in the earth, or like the tall cedar, that lifts its head above the other forest trees. Those trees must have been centuries in developing. I would like to have those trees, or trees like them. I wish the gentleman from New York would tell us how we can get those trees. The officials in charge of this service, it is understood, are going to start, perhaps, in a year from now. I would like to ask the chairman to tell us how we can get them.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes in order to answer the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE] that this is what Colonel Greeley, who has charge of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, said in the hearings:

What we actually expect to accomplish is this: At the present time all of the forest planting in the country amounts to less than 40,000 acres a year; what the Federal Government does, what the States do—

The idea is for the Federal Government to cooperate with the States, of course—

what is done by the farmers, what is done by everybody else—the entire amount is less than 40,000 acres a year, as compared with about 360,000 acres a year in Japan alone. Now, if we get this activity going, even with the \$50,000 proposed for this year, we expect to increase that acreage by at least 10,000 acres a year planted.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Just one moment, please.

And to get that 10,000 acres planted where we believe it will do the most good, namely, on the parts of our farms that are not adapted to agricultural crops but will make good timber crops.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Well, I think the folks over in Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois know all about this. I think their system is perfect, so far as it could be made so, and I want to say to the chairman that our farmers are anxious to cooperate with the Government if they have some information and know how to do it. Now, we are creating a separate bureau for this purpose?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. No. This is not my act. This is the act of Congress. I voted for the act, and I believe the gentleman from Kansas voted for it.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I am trying to find out a little more about it than I know. That is why I have asked these questions.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. It is a new act, and I would suggest that if the gentleman desires more information than Colonel Greeley has given in the hearings he take the matter up with him.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. He knows as much or more about it than anybody else, and he is a very estimable gentleman. But this is a new proposition.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I am already instructed in a degree. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL FOREST LANDS

For the acquisition of additional lands at headwaters of navigable streams, to be expended under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), as amended, \$1,000,000, of which amount not to exceed \$14,800 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to address myself to the chairman of the subcommittee. Is this appropriation for the perpetuity of the so-called Weeks Act?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I think it was last year or the year before that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], who is a member of the commission provided by this law, made a very elucidating statement before the Agricultural Committee as to what this commission had already accomplished and what it hoped to accomplish. At that time it seemed to be the policy of this commission to buy as much as possible of the hardwood timber watersheds of this country, and my recollection is that he stated at that time that there were tentative contracts for the purchase of a great deal of land, but that the contracts had not been carried out for the lack of appropriations. My recollection further is that year before last you appropriated \$400,000 under this item, last year \$800,000, and this year, under the authorization of the original act, you appropriate \$1,000,000. Does the gentleman think it is the policy of the department to undertake to carry out the Weeks Act by yearly acquiring more of the watersheds of this country?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. I thought I made that clear in my remarks explaining the bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was not fortunate enough to be present and hear the gentleman's remarks. Is it contemplated by this commission to use the \$1,000,000 carried in this item for the purchase of more land?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. I will repeat briefly what I tried to convey to the House at that time. Under the Weeks Act they have a certain organization and they claim that with the \$400,000 or \$450,000, the amount appropriated, I think, for the fiscal year 1924, it is impossible to keep that organization intact and functioning and at the same time have money with which to purchase land. Now, as I understand it, they claim that on the basis of \$1,000,000 they can keep that organization functioning and purchase each year about the amount of land the commission thinks the Government ought to purchase annually. That is my notion about it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Do the hearings disclose or does the Agricultural Department indicate to the committee what character of land will be purchased during the ensuing year, and in what part of the United States?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. If the gentleman will refer to page 617 of the hearings he will find a table showing in what States the purchases have been made, the number of acres, the average price, and the value. The States are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Practically that statement is already in the hearings before the Agricultural Committee—that is, as to what they have already purchased. I am not so much interested in the geography of this as I am in the character of watersheds they propose to buy and in territory where there is hardwood timber, and I was wondering whether it was the purpose of the commission to buy any watersheds of hardwood timber out of this \$1,000,000 appropriation. I certainly hope the commission may see fit to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PASSENGER-CARRYING VEHICLES

That not to exceed \$150,000 of the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$46,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles, and that such vehicles shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of motor trucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to purchase, from the funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. L. p. 212), not to exceed \$35,000 for motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles to replace such vehicles transferred under authority of the acts of February 28, 1919 (40 Stat. L. p. 1201), March 15, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 530), and November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. L. p. 212), from the War Department and retained and used by the Secretary of Agriculture in the construction and maintenance of national forest roads or other roads constructed under his direct supervision which are or may become unserviceable: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall on the first day of each regular session of Congress make a report to Congress showing the amount expended under the provisions of this paragraph during the preceding fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may exchange motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for vehicles, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, or boats purchased by him.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he has any figures showing how many trucks the War Department has turned over to the Department of Agriculture that have been distributed among the States for this highway work and whether they continue to have any of these trucks on hand. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think most of those trucks are worn out.

Mr. BRIGGS. It was my impression some time ago when we passed an act providing for the transfer of these surplus trucks in the hands of the Army to the Department of Agriculture for distribution among the States there were quite a number of them on hand, and I was just wondering whether they have all been distributed or not. My impression is the War Department stated they turned over all they had to the Department of Agriculture, and I wanted to get some idea about what that distribution was.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think they were turned over and they are now worn out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to the gentleman that all the trucks that have been declared surplus have been disposed of and the only thing remaining on hand as surplus is explosives. There may be some more trucks on hand, but they have not been declared surplus, and therefore they can not touch them.

Mr. BRIGGS. The War Department tells me they have not any more trucks for disposition and that they have turned them all over to the Agricultural Department.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.
The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act as amended, \$76,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed \$454,971 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, being \$25,000,000, the remainder of the sum of \$50,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923; \$35,700,000, the remainder of the sum of \$65,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; and \$15,300,000, being part of the sum of \$75,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, by paragraph 1 of section 4 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1923, approved June 19, 1922.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been asked to make a statement relative to the appropriation for public highways; in fact, I have received some criticism for my action on the committee, for which I have no apology to make. I am willing to stand by my action through thick and thin.

In a general way let me call the attention of the House to the appropriations for highway construction since the commencement of this work.

In 1917 the first authorization for appropriation was \$5,000,000; in 1918, \$10,000,000; in 1919, \$65,000,000; in 1920, \$95,000,000; in 1921, \$100,000,000; and in 1922, \$75,000,000.

In all of these years the same year the authorization was made Congress appropriated the full amount of the authorization, so that appropriations could not get behind because the full amount authorized and the full program contemplated by the law was appropriated.

In 1923 we began to get behind. For that year Congress authorized \$50,000,000 to be appropriated, but we only appropriated \$25,000,000, leaving a balance to be carried over and appropriated the next year or in future years of \$25,000,000. In the year 1924 the law authorized us to appropriate \$65,000,000. However, we did not appropriate but \$29,300,000, leaving a balance of \$35,700,000 to be carried over for future years, in addition to the \$25,000,000 carried over from the year preceding. In 1925 the law authorized us to appropriate \$75,000,000, when, as a matter of fact, we appropriated only \$13,000,000, leaving \$62,000,000 to be appropriated in future years.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. According to the bill, as I understand it, at the bottom of page 77, there was appropriated for the year 1925 all but \$15,300,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. For the year 1925 we appropriated only \$13,000,000, leaving \$62,000,000 to be carried over to this or future years.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman listen to the reading of the bill, as reported by your committee:

And \$15,300,000, being part of the sum of \$75,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925.

As I understand the action of the committee, you are withholding the \$15,300,000 of the \$75,000,000 that has already been appropriated.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But you segregate the years. It has all come to one total now, and the grand total is \$122,700,000 that we are behind for the past three years in our appropriations.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; that is possibly true. I am only taking the report of your committee on the last authorization for 1925.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The misunderstanding is in one year being segregated.

Therefore, gentlemen, when your subcommittee met this year we were confronted with the situation that there was \$122,700,000 unappropriated what we were authorized to appropriate in three preceding years.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question for the purpose of getting his comment upon a few paragraphs of the report of his committee?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman why the committee reported \$4,000,000 less than the estimate submitted in the Budget. I suppose there is some good reason for that. Then I would like to ask the gentleman to state

a little more exactly than is done in the report what is meant by this statement in the report:

During the fiscal year 1926 if the Bureau of Public Roads discovers that the amount made available by this bill is insufficient Congress will be in session and a deficiency appropriation can be estimated and appropriated for.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will answer the gentleman in the course of my remarks. We were confronted with the fact that in the authorization for the past years we did not appropriate the \$122,700,000. The Bureau of the Budget returned estimates for \$80,000,000. On examination of the witnesses we find that the department will actually pay out in withdrawals from the Treasury this fiscal year \$90,000,000, leaving, in round numbers, \$4,000,000 for next year. The Department of Agriculture in its estimates concluded that it would take \$90,000,000 to meet the actual withdrawals from the Treasury for the fiscal year 1926. The Budget recommended \$80,000,000, and with the \$4,000,000 would be \$84,000,000 to meet the estimates of the department of \$90,000,000. We did not appropriate that amount. We appropriated \$76,000,000. The fact is, gentlemen, there is going to be a deficiency anyhow. If you appropriate the Budget estimate of \$80,000,000, there is going to be a deficiency of \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000. So that it does not make any difference whether you have a deficiency of \$14,000,000 next year or a deficiency of \$6,000,000 to \$10,000,000.

Now, what do we mean by the statement in the report which the gentleman from Virginia has read. It means this, that whether we appropriate in this bill seventy-six million or eighty million, that the Department of Agriculture believes there will be a deficiency, it means that the Bureau of the Budget believes that there will be a deficiency, and if there is a deficiency that it will be promptly submitted by the department to the Budget, approved by the Budget, favorably reported by the Appropriation Committee, and passed by this House with no injury to the highway construction of the United States. That is understood on all sides.

I understand that the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAGEE] does not believe that there will be a deficiency, but in this fiscal year they have spent up to December 1 fifty-three and one-half million dollars, or more than \$10,000,000 a month. Undoubtedly for the next fiscal year we will need at least \$90,000,000 or perhaps more, and we carry in this bill \$76,000,000 and the \$4,000,000 left over from last year makes \$80,000,000, and that will carry us up until March, 1926, before the money is exhausted, and as the next Congress convenes December, 1925, we will have ample time to pass a deficiency appropriation. I wanted the House to understand my action in the matter, and to understand that in this bill for the fiscal year 1926 and the appropriations for good roads for the fiscal year 1927, we will have to provide \$122,700,000 to pay our contractual obligations to the cooperative States, which indebtedness was incurred during the fiscal years 1923, 1924, and 1925; so that the fiscal years 1926 and 1927 have inherited from the fiscal years 1923, 1924, and 1925 this indebtedness of \$122,700,000 on good roads alone. Let us hope any other bequests will be a blessing, not a burden.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for myself that I voted for the \$80,000,000 in this bill because in my judgment that will be sufficient for the purposes of the department. The claim of an alleged deficiency did not have any weight with me, and I will tell you why. In 1924 it was estimated that \$85,000,000 would be necessary. As a matter of fact they used only about \$80,000,000. In other words, their estimate was \$5,000,000 above what they actually used. In the next place it seems to me that the House has at least given an indication that in its judgment by the passage of the Dowell bill \$75,000,000 a year is about the amount that we ought to appropriate. The Dowell bill passed last session called for an expenditure of \$75,000,000 for each of two years from July 1, 1925. I voted to give the department the \$80,000,000, \$5,000,000 above that sum. I find no fault with the recommendation made by the committee. I read with great interest after the representative from the Department of Agriculture appeared before us the remarks made by the chief of the bureau, Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, on December 4, 1924, and published in the Evening Star on that date, at the Fourth Annual Convention of the Highway Research Board. This is what Mr. MacDonald is reported to have said:

Scientific research into the processes of making lasting roads has developed new and economical practices, which should result in cutting the road-making bill of the Nation down by nearly one-fourth. Thomas H. MacDonald, chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, told the Highway

Research Board at its fourth annual convention, which opened to-day at the new home of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council.

Application of time-saving methods by contractors in road construction work, by overcoming of delays and use of proper machinery, would save between 20 and 25 per cent of the total spent on road construction, Mr. MacDonald estimated. Applied to the billion dollars he said was annually spent on roads in the United States, this would represent an enormous saving to the taxpayer.

Whether there will be a deficiency or not I do not know. If there should be a deficiency, as my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has stated, it can be taken care of, but it would not surprise me, looking into the future as far as 1926 and taking the statement of Mr. MacDonald at 50 per cent of its face value, if we should have a surplus of ten or fifteen million dollars. In other words, if such savings can be effected as he intimated at this convention, it is possible that in 1926 we may not spend more than \$60,000,000 or \$65,000,000. We are safe anyway. I simply wanted to make my position clear.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it contemplated by the committee making this appropriation that there will be a deficiency?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. It is not so contemplated by myself.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not the fact that there should be no deficiency in these appropriations if they are made properly?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I can only tell the gentleman why I voted for the appropriation. I can not speak for the other members of the committee.

Mr. DOWELL. I do not understand why the Committee on Appropriations should come before the House with an appropriation and intimate that it is the understanding that there will be a deficiency in the appropriation. I think they should hold the department to the actual appropriation, and if we are going to get anywhere it seems to me there must be a limitation to the actual appropriations made. I do not understand about this intimation that this appropriation is made and that there will be a deficiency to come before us later.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I have not made that intimation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I invite the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to line 9 on page 74, where the following language occurs—

together with any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for this purpose.

Are such sums as that included in the total in the last line, line 5 on page 78 of the bill? It occurs to me it would be very difficult, indeed, for us to keep up with the obligations of the Government if many such appropriations were carried as are carried in line 9, page 74. I wonder whether there are many occurrences of that kind throughout the bill?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not know that I understand the gentleman exactly.

Mr. HASTINGS. On page 74 you appropriate the unexpended balance that has heretofore been appropriated for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question. My information is that in the last deficiency bill was an item of \$3,500,000. Whether that has all been expended I do not know, but we wanted to provide in this paragraph that in case of an emergency any unexpended balance of such appropriation carried in that deficiency bill would be available.

Mr. HASTINGS. It would be continued.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. By this language.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may return to page 30, line 13, of the bill, for the purpose of permitting the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] to offer an amendment relating to the disease called nailhead rust attacking tomatoes. I do so for this reason. I am a member of the subcommittee on deficiencies of the Appropriations Committee. This matter was brought to the attention of the deficiency committee while considering the deficiency bill at the last session. It was then earnestly presented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS], and it appeared from statements made to the committee then that this disease was making great ravages on the tomato, and that tomato growers in Florida had lost possibly a million dollars as a result of it. The Department of Agriculture wanted and was given \$10,000 on a three-year program, as I now recall. That \$10,000 was appropriated, and it seems to me, and I am told that the Agricultural Department so

states, that unless another \$10,000 is appropriated for next year on this three-year program the \$10,000 which has already been appropriated, which is doubtless in process of expenditure, will be wasted. They think they can control this disease, and for the reasons stated and the fact that this disease is now being given consideration by the Department of Agriculture, and it having originally recommended this program, I ask that the gentleman from Florida be permitted to offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to return to page 30 of the bill, line 13. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment read so that we will know what it is. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] spoke to me about. He said it first came up at the time of the preparation of the deficiency bill. I am not a member of the subcommittee on deficiencies, and as I understand, and as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will confirm, if true, an item of \$10,000 for this purpose was put into the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For this year.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Precisely; and what is desired now is to put a similar item in this bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For next year.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I told Mr. SEARS of Florida that my attention not having been called to the matter and no hearings held by the committee, yet if some member of the deficiency committee would come on the floor and explain it to the Members I would not object to turning back and putting it in the bill, and I have no objection so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the amendment be read for information. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 30, after line 13, insert: "For investigation, eradication, and control of the tomato disease commonly known as nailhead rust, \$10,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to page 30, line 13? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair would suggest before returning and taking up the matter that there is one line left which the Clerk has not yet read, and the Chair suggests that the line be read first in order to complete the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Department of Agriculture, \$124,637,715.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I understand that the Clerk was authorized to correct any and all totals.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, after line 13, insert: "For investigation, eradication, and control of the tomato disease commonly known as nailhead rust, \$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] for requesting unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer the amendment—

For investigation, eradication, and control of the tomato disease commonly known as nail-head rust, \$10,000.

Last year it was estimated the growers of tomatoes lost approximately \$1,000,000 because of this disease. The amount asked for is small, but the Department of Agriculture is satisfied that by appropriating said amount annually, not to exceed three years, they will be able to cope with this disease.

Last year the growers, out of their own funds, spent several thousand dollars trying to discover some method of control; but, not having the facilities that the Government has, they did

not make much progress. Realizing as I do the importance of finding some way to eradicate or at least control this disease, I sincerely trust the amendment which I have offered will be adopted.

I understand the chairman of the subcommittee will not oppose the amendment and, therefore, I will not take up more of your time.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TREADWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10404, the Agricultural appropriation bill, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment; if not, the Chair will put them in gross?

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAGEE of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker lays before the House the following resignation.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1924.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, effective at once.

Very respectfully yours,

WILLIAM B. BOWLING.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

S. 116. An act to amend section 196 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 933. An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1343. An act to authorize the widening of Fourth Street, south of Cedar Street NW. in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

AUTOMATIC TRAIN CONTROL

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the bill H. R. 9773.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this opportunity to extend my remarks on H. R. 9773, a bill I introduced in the last session of Congress, for the one reason that it is a humanitarian measure and a great protection to the employees of the railroads and the traveling public, and Congress should be fully advised. I have no interest in any way in any of the train-control devices which are in existence, and my only thought in bringing this matter to your attention is that the people should be given the protection which train control affords. It is a fact that the only device that has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission is the Regan automatic train-control device, and since this name is used frequently in the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it will have to be referred to many times. I want to explain now that the plea of the railroads and the newspaper propaganda against this device makes it very embarrassing for anyone who has taken an interest in the proposition. I know that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been embarrassed over the use of this to such an extent that it has become almost a crime in the eyes of some people to mention the name of the Regan device. I again state that I have no

pride in the name of any device in the name of Regan and have no interest other than the humanitarian end of the proposition. I will have to say many times that the Regan device is the one which has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission; all other devices have so far not been approved; and it is the one I have myself inspected and seen its successful operation.

Mr. Speaker, in order to explain the necessity for the approval of H. R. 9773, it will be necessary for me to state briefly the history of train control, and I am laying before Congress information I have gathered principally from the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission and from my personal observation of the operation of train control.

HISTORICAL

It has long been recognized that some form of protection should be provided to prevent railroad collisions. This subject has been a live issue since 1880, with ever-increasing interest, until in 1906 Congress passed an act directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the subject of automatic train control, as a result of which the commission appointed a body known as the Block Signal and Train Control Board. Reports were made to the commission annually from 1908 to 1912, inclusive. Several hundred different automatic stop and train-control systems were inspected by the board, and annual reports were made to the Congress containing such details as the commission thought necessary.

The Block Signal and Train Control Board was superseded in the development of this subject by the Bureau of Safety in 1913, and beginning with 1914 reports were made by the Bureau of Safety covering tests and inspections of many additional devices.

On January 14, 1919, the United States Railway Administration created an automatic train control committee, which also inspected a number of devices, reporting from time to time to the director general.

Definite action was taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission on January 10, 1922, when under authority of section 26 of the transportation act the commission issued order No. 13413, under which 49 railroads were given an opportunity to show cause why an order should not be entered requiring the installation of automatic stop or automatic train-control devices upon designated portions of their lines. Hearings were held before the commission during March and April, 1922, as a result of which the railroads failed utterly to show cause why the order should not be enforced; whereupon, on June 13, 1922, the commission made its order permanent, under the terms of which 49 railroads, specified by name, were required to install on or before the 1st of January, 1925, an automatic stop or train-control device or devices applicable to or operated in connection with all road engines running on or over at least one full passenger-engine division.

In this order the commission set forth the general requirements covering the design and construction of such systems, and provided that each installation made pursuant to such order should when completed be subject to inspection by and approval of the commission. In issuing this order the commission made the following statement:

We do not desire to force any carrier to adopt a particular type which it believes is not entirely suitable to its peculiar needs if there are others available which within a reasonable time may be shown to be more suitable. In view, however, of the investigations which have already been made and the time which has elapsed we are of the opinion that a six months' period will give sufficient time for any road to decide upon the device it should select. Within this time, provided a sufficient installation is made and intensive tests of the device are conducted, it can be determined whether or not the device will be suitable.

As to what has been done to carry out the order of the commission, this will be referred to later.

On January 14, 1924, the commission issued a second order requiring the installation of 92 additional divisions, and specified that installation should be completed by February 1, 1926. This order included an additional division upon 47 of the carriers contained in the first order, and additional carriers as shown therein. Hearings were held before the commission May 7, to May 17, 1924, inclusive, and again the railroads were fully represented. It was shown conclusively that an automatic train-control system which fully complied with the requisites of the commission and which had received the approval of the commission was available.

During the time the commission has been investigating this subject, and in the period 1906 to 1921, as shown by the records of the commission, there were 106,473 train accidents, in which 6,142 persons were killed, 95,936 injured, and a property loss of \$80,386,694. Of rear-end collisions there were 17,043, in

which 1,914 persons were killed and 25,974 injured, with a property loss of \$21,507,894. Of head-on collisions there were 9,255, in which 2,412 persons were killed and 34,708 injured, with a property loss of \$19,461,769.

The latest figures available and which will give you the facts regarding conditions at the present time are found in the Interstate Commerce Commission's report for the month of October, 1924. This report shows that during the month of August, 1924, 95 employees of the railroads on duty were killed, and 2,567 were injured; 14 passengers were killed, and 779 were injured. For the eight months of this year ending with August the report shows that 788 employees on duty were killed, and 20,932 were injured; 101 passengers were killed, and 3,736 were injured.

The following is taken from the Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of December 1, 1924:

The record of accidents investigated by our forces for the year ended June 30, 1924, shows 100 collisions and derailments, in which 245 persons were killed and 1,501 injured. These accidents may be divided into four groups: (1) derailments; (2) collisions in automatic-signal territory; (3) collisions in nonautomatic-signal territory; and (4) collisions in time-table and train-order territory and yards. The following table shows the number of accidents in each group, the number in each group which probably would have been prevented if an adequate system of automatic train control had been in use, and the number of persons killed and injured in such preventable accidents:

Group	Accidents	Preventable accidents	Persons killed in preventable accidents	Persons injured in preventable accidents
Derailments.....	46	14	19	77
Collisions in automatic-signal territory.....	12	9	18	122
Collisions in nonautomatic-signal territory.....	10	8	18	134
Collisions in time-table and train-order territory and yards.....	32	19	58	447
Total.....	100	50	113	780

The number of preventable accidents represent 50 per cent, the number of persons killed represent 46 per cent, and the number injured in such preventable accidents represent 52 per cent of the total number of accidents investigated, persons killed, and persons injured.

The importance of continuous effort to prevent railway accidents, with their great loss of life, injury to persons, and destruction of property, can hardly be overstated.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, December 8, 1924.

HON. H. P. SNYDER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of December 2, asking for certain data in connection with railroad accidents since May 24, 1924, was received in due course. I called upon our Bureau of Safety for the information you desire and understand that your office was advised by telephone that preparation of a list of all accidents since May 24, 1924, would require the tabulation of several thousand items. There are inclosed copies of our monthly statistical reports, which I understand will meet your present needs. These reports cover the period from May to August, both inclusive. Figures for subsequent months have not as yet been compiled. You will note that the number of accidents classed as "train accidents" are as follows:

May.....	1,761
June.....	1,654
July.....	1,722
August.....	1,906
Total.....	7,043

There is also inclosed a list of all accidents in which our Bureau of Safety made investigations and reports since May 24, 1924, which these reports state would not have occurred if an adequate system of automatic train control had been in use.

At the present time there are 12 accidents under investigation, 11 of which occurred since May 24. Of the 11, the result of the bureau's investigation as to the accident on the Baltimore & Ohio at Weverton, Md., on November 15, which resulted in the death of 1 and the injury of 8 persons, has led to the conclusion that it would have been prevented by automatic train control. Investigation of one accident has developed that it would not have been so prevented, and the investigation of the remaining nine has not been sufficiently completed to permit of expression of a conclusion thereon.

Very truly yours,

H. C. HALL, Chairman.

Accidents investigated by the Bureau of Safety since May 24, 1924, in the report covering which it was stated that the particular accident would not have occurred had an adequate system of automatic train control been in use

Date	Railroad	Location	Persons killed	Persons injured
June 19	Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis	Adairsville, Ga.....	3	20
24	Hocking Valley.....	Linworth, Ohio.....	1	1
July 10	Spokane, Portland & Seattle	Avon, Oreg.....	1	5
29	Piedmont & Northern	Charlotte, N. C.....	1	15
Aug. 15	Chesapeake & Ohio.....	Dayton, Ky.....	1	1
16	Texas & Pacific.....	Grand Prairie, Tex.....	1	1
30	New York Central.....	Syracuse, N. Y.....	0	43
Sept. 5	Missouri Pacific.....	Howcott, La.....	5	5
7	Louisville & Nashville	Frankfort, Ky.....	3	1
24	Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	Des Moines, Iowa.....	1	1
Oct. 3	Southern Pacific.....	Noonan, Tex.....	2	2
3	Baltimore & Ohio.....	Aviston, Ill.....	1	16
13	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western	New Milford, Pa.....	3	17
19	International.....	Tonawanda, N. Y.....	4	98
19	Portland Electric.....	Naez, Oreg.....	0	6
Nov. 11	Lehigh Valley.....	Aldene, N. J.....	1	0
	16 accidents listed.....		28	232

Investigation has been completed of 27 other accidents which have occurred since May 24, 1924; in the reports covering these investigations no statement was made concerning automatic train control. These 27 accidents resulted in the death of 62 persons and the injury of 326 persons.

I wish to call the attention of Congress to the following editorials which have been recently published in the Washington Post:

[From Washington Post, Thursday, November 27, 1924]

FOR SAFETY IN TRAVEL

The time originally granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the installation of train-control appliances upon railroads will expire on January 1 next. Severe penalties are imposed by law upon such railroads as fail to comply with the commission's order. Some of the leading railroad companies are delinquent and will not be able to install the required apparatus by January 1. They are preparing an appeal for an extension of time.

There is no reasonable excuse for further delay or for an extension of time. The first order of the commission was issued nearly three years ago. The fact that some railroads complied with the order is proof that all could have done so if they had been so inclined. One reason after another was assigned for failure to obey the law, but the Interstate Commerce Commission appears to have reached the limit of its patient consideration of these excuses, and certainly the law and the public interest require that no further delays be granted.

Although some railroad companies assert that train control is in its experimental stage, the fact is well established that appliances are successfully in operation upon many roads. The prevention of accidents due to the fallible human element has been demonstrated. At the same time, on roads not equipped with train-control devices frightful accidents have occurred which would have been prevented by automatic appliances designed to stop trains in cases where the engineers ignore the usual warnings and plunge into collisions.

During the last two years many passengers have been killed because of the failure of railroads to install train-control devices. After January 1, in case of such accidents on railroads that have failed to comply with the law, it is probable that heavy damage suits could be sustained, thereby subjecting delinquent railroads to double penalties. The legal counsel of the railroads may conclude that the risks incurred by further evasion of law are more costly than the expense involved in installing safety devices. When that point is reached the railroads will doubtless install train-control devices without further pressure, but in the meantime human life may be needlessly lost.

The law commands the installation of train control. The Interstate Commerce Commission has gone beyond the limit of its authority in granting time for such installations. It is up to the railroad executives to comply with their plain duty. They need not expect to hold public sympathy in other directions if they persistently fail and refuse to provide the safety devices required by law.

[From the Washington Post, Monday, December 8, 1924]

NEEDLESS DANGER IN TRAVEL

Another rear-end collision occurred recently in which human life was lost and many persons injured. The "accident" occurred near Englewood Station, Chicago. It was preventable; and if the railroad had been equipped with train-control apparatus, the blunder of the train crew could not have resulted in a crash. A Pennsylvania passenger train from Cincinnati ran into the rear end of a special train from

Columbus. One person was killed and 25 injured, some of them seriously. Two cars of the special were crushed, and the engine of the Cincinnati train was derailed. The special train was picking up speed upon leaving the station and the regular train was slowing down when the collision occurred.

The law requires the railroads of the United States to equip themselves with train-control apparatus. Three years' notice has been given for the first installation, and the time limit will expire January 1 next. The railroads that have failed and refused to install equipment are asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant them further time, on one pretext or another.

The time has come for decisive action by the Government. There is no excuse for further delay. The railroads that have failed to install equipment are trifling with human life for the sake of saving money. It is an intolerable affront to the public, and a terrible calamity may occur at any time to stir the people to the danger to which they are unnecessarily subjected.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will not be doing its duty if it overlooks the public safety and interest and extends favors to the railroads that have flagrantly failed to obey the law. Let the law be applied!

Much has been said about the protection afforded by automatic block signals, yet the statistics of the commission show that between July, 1911, and March 31, 1924, there were 111 collisions caused by failure of the engineman to observe and be governed by signal indications, in which there were 510 persons killed and 2,458 injured, with a property loss—not including damage to lading—of \$1,539,074. Such human failures are not surprising, however, when one considers that the safety to trains, under present operating conditions, largely depends upon the engineman observing and being governed by a small signal light set at the top of a pole, often located at considerable distance away from the track and frequently obscured by fog, smoke, rain, or snow. All of these accidents and all of this tremendous loss of life and property occurred while the commission was investigating the subject of automatic train control.

The orders of the commission were undoubtedly based upon accurate information developed by thorough and long service inspections of automatic stop and automatic train-control devices then in operation, all of which were of the intermittent contact or ramp type, including the following:

(a) Miller automatic stop, in service since November 1, 1914, on 105.4 miles of double track—Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad, including 85 locomotives.

(b) American automatic stop, in service since June, 1919, on 21 miles of single track—Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, including 37 locomotives.

(c) The Regan automatic train-control system in service since March, 1920, on 22.4 miles of double track—Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway, including 20 locomotives.

As distinguished from the Miller and the American automatic stop systems, the Regan automatic train-control system is so arranged as to include speed control, such as to enforce prescribed limited speed when approaching danger, and an automatic stop or prescribed low-speed control when danger is immediately impending. With this system the engineman must be alert to continue even at low speed when a dangerous condition prevails—as a misplaced switch, broken rail, open drawbridge, train standing on siding fouling the main track, or a train immediately ahead.

In other words, while the other systems described permit a train to move at full speed in the face of danger, the Regan system stops the train unless the engineman is alert, when by pushing a button he is permitted to enter the block at low speed, while with the other systems he may release and then proceed at full speed.

Fully satisfied with the test installation of the Regan system, covering a period in excess of three years, the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway, in compliance with the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, decided to install, and did install, the Regan system throughout its Illinois division, and in line with the order, submitted plans and specifications and promptly complied therewith, completing the installation of 165.4 miles of double main track from Blue Island to Rock Island, Ill., and 102 locomotives on November 1, 1923. This installation was inspected by the commission, such inspection being completed November 30, 1923, and approved by the commission on December 17, 1923.

It will be noted that the Rock Island complied with the order of the commission and completed its installation of the Regan system one year before the time limit set by the order. Further, the Regan automatic train-control system was ap-

proved by the commission as in full compliance with the requisites laid down by that body.

This installation was completed at a total cost of \$235,789, including all expense of installation.

INTERCHANGEABILITY

The question of interchangeability has been set forth as one of the difficulties preventing such carriers from complying with the order of the commission. What are the facts as to this? The records show that the New York Central lines are testing three different types of automatic train control, none of which is interchangeable with the others.

The Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville, the Chicago & Eastern Illinois, and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, using the same terminal at Chicago, are testing three different types of train control, none of which is interchangeable.

Reference to the tabulation of carriers, which is made a part of this record, will show the position of the carriers as to the adoption of automatic train-control appliances and the inconsistency between the demand for interchangeability and the devices now under test.

If interchangeability is to be secured, such that trains using joint tracks or detour will operate successfully with automatic train control, surely the best solution of the problem lies in the railroads of the same operating group adopting the same automatic train-control system. The train-control system adopted by the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway is the only train-control system in service which was installed in line with the order of the commission and which has been approved by the commission. As such, it has set the standard with which other railroads in its territory should comply.

FUEL ECONOMY—SAVING IN OPERATION

In addition to the conservation of life and property, experience has shown tremendous savings in operation due to this scientific improvement in railroad service, as under a train-control system not alone is safe operation insured but, substituting the principle of "spacing trains by restricting their speed" rather than by stopping them, as is done under the present antiquated method of railroading, train control becomes an asset and a distinct earning power. Whereas the American Railway Association rules provide that a train shall stop at automatic block signals in the "stop" position, and then proceed under a certain speed prescribed by rule alone, the Regan automatic train-control system, as heretofore stated, compels the train to reduce speed and compels the engineman to indicate his alertness to the situation by acknowledging the "stop" signal and permits the train to proceed under safe speed without stopping. Such is the practice and the rule on the Illinois division of the Rock Island, where a check of the operation during the month of July, 1924, showed that in the movement of 1,105 freight trains and 1,183 passenger trains there were a total of 6,078 freight-train stops and 485 passenger-train stops eliminated, which, capitalized at the American Railway Association figure of \$1.92 per stop, would amount to the tremendous figure of \$150,000 per annum in the saving of fuel, wear and tear on equipment, and loss of time.

To stop a heavy-tonnage train unnecessarily costs money; to install a proper system of train control increases track capacity and saves money.

Mr. Aishton, president of the American Railway Association, is authority for the statement that if 1 pound of coal were saved per 1,000 gross-ton miles, it would mean a saving of \$3,165,000 per annum. To stop a heavy-tonnage freight train unnecessarily consumes an average of approximately 665 pounds of coal, so that when safety can be secured with economy in such measure as the figures above indicate with the installation of automatic train control there is evidently no good reason why further delay should be permitted if the reason for delay is based on the cost of installation.

RAILROADS—AND COMPLIANCE WITH ORDER NO. 13413

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway has complied with the order of the commission, and the Regan automatic train-control system has been approved. At this moment no other train-control system has been approved. It is evident that other railroads have made no serious attempt to carry out the order of the commission. Numerous experiments and tests are being made on short sections of track, evidently with the hope that there will be an extension of time granted and that installations over additional mileage which may be ordered by the commission will be postponed and probably abandoned. The railroads have already succeeded in securing modification of the second order of the commission covering a large number of railroads which were scheduled for completion by January 1, 1926; but order of June 13, 1922, as it applies to

the carriers listed herein, and which were ordered to have their installations completed on a full passenger engine division by January 1, 1925, was not modified or extended.

Automatic train control should be installed without further delay. The attempt of the railroad companies to cloud the issue should be discouraged, considering that an approved automatic train-control system is available and that the manufacturers of this device are conscientiously striving to secure installations; that they have the ability to make good; that they have successfully met all tests laid down by the commission or by any railroad. Considering further that an automatic train-control system is operating successfully and to the entire satisfaction of the officials and the men on the railroad upon which it is installed there should be no further delay in its adoption.

The officers are outspoken in their commendation of the device, and the locomotive engineers of the division on which it is installed are enthusiastically in favor of it. There is no greater obligation resting upon the railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Congress than that of security and safety for the traveling public, for there is no condition in life where a competent and valuable citizen is so helpless to protect himself from bodily injury or death as when riding as a passenger on a railroad.

As to what has been done by the railroads over the many years the commission has been investigating this subject, a study shows that no installations were made on any railroad except upon the initiative and at the sole expense of inventors and manufacturers. Even on the Rock Island Railroad the preliminary installation was made entirely at the expense of the Regan Co., and it was not until the system had qualified in service for a period covering three years that authority was given by the board of directors to equip a full operating division.

In spite of the fact that an approved automatic train-control system is available that complies with all of the requisites covering design and construction as laid down by the commission, that it is in daily service on one of the great trunk-line railways, under all conditions of traffic, performing to the full satisfaction of the officials of the railroad, an installation comprising 330 miles of track and 102 locomotives; in spite of the fact that all witnesses from that railroad testifying before the Interstate Commerce Commission, including the vice president in charge of operation, locomotive engineers, and others, fully indorsed the device; in spite of the fact that locomotive engineers of the division on which it is installed have by resolution unanimously indorsed the device and recommended its extension; regardless of the fact that this train-control system qualified under the period of test outlined by the commission and that the manufacturers are prepared to install it on any railroad, the railroads of this country have by a studied campaign of camouflage and in violation of the principles that should actuate these common carriers set out to defeat the will of Congress and the orders of the commission.

What is the reason for the delay? The device approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as heretofore stated, has fully qualified. I understand that a supply of the apparatus is available. It has demonstrated that tremendous savings in operation may be secured on lines of dense traffic, and this information is all in the hands of the railroad companies. The subject of train control has been taken out from the realm of theory and is now an actual accomplishment.

What is the reason for failure of the carriers to install this device?

Let us analyze the situation by reference to the carriers covered by the order, which shows the following:

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Complete division. Nonapproved device.

Atlantic Coast Line: Short-track section General Railway Signal Co.'s intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad: No installation.

Boston & Albany (New York Central): Some experiments made. No installation.

Boston & Maine: No installation.

Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh: Small test installation. General Railway Signal Co.'s induction system. Disapproved by the commission. No further installation.

Central Railroad of New Jersey: No installation.

Chesapeake & Ohio: American intermittent ramp type; 61 miles single track and 64 locomotives equipped. This system has no speed control. Nonapproved device.

Chicago & Alton: Experimenting with Bostwick induction 20 miles roadway, 16 locomotives, vicinity of Bloomington, Ill. Nonapproved device.

Chicago & Eastern Illinois: Miller intermittent ramp type, installed in 1914; 105.4 miles double track, 65 locomotives. Nonapproved device.

Chicago & Erie: No installation.

Chicago & North Western: No installation.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy: Twenty-mile Sprague intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville: 20-mile roadside

Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville: Twenty-mile roadside, six locomotives, Sprague intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. River division. Nonapproved device.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific: Regan automatic train-control system, intermittent ramp type, 165 miles double track, 102 locomotives equipped. Approved device.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha: This carrier has been relieved by the commission from compliance with the order, although a line of comparatively dense traffic.

Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific: Thirty-five and two-tenths miles General Railway Signal Co.'s intermittent induction, with several locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis (New York Central): Twenty-mile roadside, six locomotive equipments. General Railway Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

Delaware & Hudson: Four miles Federal Signal Co.'s continuous induction, 1923. Nonapproved device. No further attempt at installation.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western: Twenty miles Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction, 10 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Erie Railroad: No installation.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio (Southern Pacific): Fifty-one miles Bostwick induction system. Nonapproved device.

Great Northern: Twenty miles Sprague intermittent induction, with seven engine equipments. Nonapproved device.

Illinois Central: Twenty miles Union Switch & Signal Co.'s modified continuous induction, with 10 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Kansas City Southern: No installation.

Lehigh Valley: Short track section, General Railway Signal Co.'s intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Long Island (Pennsylvania Railroad): No installation.

Louisville & Nashville: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

Michigan Central (New York Central): Twenty miles, General Railway Signal Co.'s continuous induction and several locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Missouri Pacific: Twenty-five miles, Bostwick intermittent induction; 29 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

New York Central: Twenty miles, Sprague intermittent induction; 15 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

New York, Chicago & St. Louis: Experimenting with small installation Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

New York, New Haven & Hartford: Experimenting with small installation Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

Norfolk & Western: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction, complete division. Nonapproved device.

Northern Pacific: Twenty miles, Sprague intermittent induction with seven locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Co.: Union Switch & Signal Co., continuous induction. Complete division. Nonapproved device.

Pennsylvania Railroad: No compliance with order as to installation on designated division. Test installation on Lewiston branch, completed 1923. Nonapproved device.

Pere Marquette: No installation.

Philadelphia & Reading: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction; complete division. Nonapproved device.

Pittsburgh & Lake Erie (New York Central): Twenty miles, Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction; 10 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis: No installation.

Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction, 25 miles; 16 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway: Twenty miles, Bostwick intermittent induction; 22 locomotives. Nonapproved device.

Southern Pacific: Bostwick intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Southern Railway: No installation.

Union Pacific: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s modified continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

West Jersey & Seashore (Pennsylvania Railroad): No installation.

Western Maryland: Relieved from order of commission.

It will be noted that none of the carriers covered by the order of the commission, other than the Rock Island, have adopted the only automatic train-control system that has been approved, and that some are installing systems that have been inspected and not approved; others are making or figuring upon small installations that have not been approved; while still others have made no evident move in the selection of a device.

It is worthy of note that carriers which are proceeding with expensive installations costing approximately \$10,000 per mile (for nonapproved devices) are among those carriers earning in excess of 6 per cent on valuation or have tremendous surpluses, in the face of the fact that the approved system can be installed at approximately \$2,000 per mile of double track, including both locomotive and roadside equipment complete.

The action of the common carriers subject to the transportation act when automatic train control is considered is deplorable. Their position has been one of consistent objection, one of constant obstruction to the consummation of the act of Congress and the orders of the commission. It is probable that they recognize the fact that the orders of the commission now confronting them cover but a small proportion of the total passenger mileage and that their tactics are based upon a desire to prevent the issuance of further orders or bring about a modification of those now in effect.

No matter what the motive may be, it is safe to say that from the viewpoint of the traveling public, which to a very large extent includes the holders of railway securities, this great improvement is here to stay, and that within a few years it will be a source of wonder how railroad trains were operated at such extremely high speeds as are now in vogue without such protection. Surely when safety, efficiency, and economy are considered, automatic train control as demonstrated in daily service on the Rock Island, stands out as one of the great engineering achievements—the utilization of the resources of nature for the benefit of mankind—and represents an immense stride toward conservation in the saving of fuel, wear and tear on equipment, and in the increased safety which it insures to the traveling public.

The responsibilities resting upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce its train-control orders are clearly defined by law. In so far as the railroads are concerned, they should be compelled to comply with the law and with the orders of the commission. Surely public safety is a matter in which partisanship can not be shown.

In opposing the order of the commission the representatives of the carriers have contended that no automatic train-control device is sufficiently developed as to warrant installation, and that such devices are in the development or experimental stages. In all fairness to the railroads who have taken this position, the statement may be made truthfully that automatic train control is advanced to a far greater degree of perfection than was the automatic signal, automatic coupler, or automatic air brake when those great improvements were adopted. Nothing could be more perfect in its operation, as demonstrated under actual service conditions, than the automatic train-control system that has been approved by the commission. Duplicating the conditions which resulted in such terrible wrecks as occurred at Porter, Ind., the Twentieth Century wreck at Forsyth, N. Y., and many others, this train-control system has demonstrated its perfection in the prevention of such accidents when for any reason the human agency fails.

In view of the facts, and the investigations and inspections by experts of the commission, it is evident that the railroads have not moved in the direction of compliance with the order of the commission with a view of finding a suitable automatic train-control system for installation; and when it is considered that the first order covers but 10,000 miles of track of a total passenger mileage in excess of 250,000 miles, or 5 per cent of the total—that but approximately 5,000 locomotives of a total of 60,000, or about 8 per cent of the total, distributed among 49 carriers—there should be prompt steps taken to enforce the order of the commission by making the penalty such as will insure prompt action.

The Congress, in section 26 of the Interstate Commerce Commission act, authorized the commission "after investigation to prescribe the installation of automatic train stops or train-control devices, or other safety devices upon the whole or any part of the railroad or any carrier by railroad subject to the act."

The commission has investigated and inspected through its experts many hundreds of inventions and systems covering a

period in excess of 18 years, and for the past three years has concentrated its attention upon investigations, inspections, and analyses of actual installations. As a result, the commission has approved the automatic train-control system which was installed by a great trunk-line railway in conformity with the order of the commission, as in full compliance with the requisites of the commission.

The time limit as set by the commission for compliance with its order for the installation of such systems, namely, January 1, 1925, is about to expire. The penalty for noncompliance is evidently inadequate to produce the desired action. Prompt and strenuous measures should be taken by the Congress and such a penalty imposed as will cause the carriers to comply with the order of the commission without further delay.

Here is the language used by Commissioner Esch, and which is concurred in by Commissioners McChord and Cox, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, with regard to the necessity of adopting train control. You will find this language on page 448, Interstate Commerce Commission Report No. 13413. He says:

With the exception of three roads that have installed devices of the ramp type the carriers generally have definitely stated to us that they will not install this latter type. Thus they discard the successful results of years of effort to develop a practicable automatic train-control device, which upon final test we have found meets all our requirements. In view of the expressed attitude of the carriers, the commission's decision and conclusions appear to have but little weight. In view also of this decision of the carriers—if they are to be permitted to adhere to it—any further expenditure of either time or money experimenting with this type of device would simply be wasted, notwithstanding the fact that it has been found by us to meet every requirement and that we have approved its installation. This would be true even though a joint committee should supervise such experimentation.

On page 449 of the same report they make this further statement:

In its original report in this case, June 13, 1922, this commission gave the history of what has been done by Congress and the commission with respect to automatic train control. Congress and this commission have been at work for more than 18 years in an endeavor to persuade and require the carriers to install automatic train control, with scant results.

And on page 450 of the same report they use this language:

We had concluded prior to our first report (1) that the need for automatic train-control devices had been clearly shown, and (2) that devices had been developed and used under actual service conditions that met this need in a practical manner. These conclusions were and still are the bases for our orders in this case. They are the results of over 15 years of study culminating in many months of tests and observations under actual service conditions. The facts are too well known to need further discussion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the face of all these facts, can it be said that the railroads of this country are going to be allowed to go on ignoring the orders of the Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission? And shall the Congress and the people of this country sit calmly by and allow people to be injured and killed almost daily, as has been pointed out in the remarks I have made, when an improved device can be installed on these roads at a reasonable cost, which would not only save thousands of people from becoming injured, but would save hundreds of lives and would be a saving on the upkeep and operation of the railroads to the extent that the interest on the cost of installation would be more than saved?

Section 26 of the interstate commerce act provides that the railroads shall be fined \$100 per day for noncompliance with the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and this penalty has brought no results, thereby furnishing the necessity for the enactment of my bill, H. R. 9773, which provides as follows:

That section 26 of the interstate commerce act as amended is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 26. That the commission may, after investigation, order any carrier by railroad subject to this act, within a time specified in the order, to install automatic train-stop or train-control devices, or other safety devices, which comply with specifications and requirements prescribed by the commission, upon the whole or any part of its railroad, such order to be issued and published at least two years before the date specified for its fulfillment: *Provided*, That a carrier shall not be held to be negligent because of its failure to install such devices upon a portion of its railroad not included in the order; and any action arising because of an accident happening upon such portion of its railroad shall be deter-

mined without consideration of the use of such devices upon another portion of its railroad. Any common carrier which refuses or neglects to comply with any order of the commission made under the authority conferred by this section shall be liable to a penalty of \$1,000 for each day that such refusal or neglect continues, which shall accrue to the United States, and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States. Every director, officer, or employee of a common carrier, or other person, in whom, at any time within the period for compliance with an order of the commission made in respect of such carrier under the authority of this section, there is vested, by appropriate action of the board of directors or the president of the carrier, the duty to cause compliance with such order (or if such action has not been taken, then every president and director of the carrier during such period), shall, if (1) an accident involving bodily injury or loss of human life occurs upon the railroad of such carrier, and (2) such accident is attributable in whole or in part to any failure to comply with the order of the commission, and (3) such director, officer, employee, or other person willfully or negligently failed to cause such compliance, on conviction of such offense in a court of competent jurisdiction, be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 or be imprisoned for not more than five years. As used in this section, the term 'board of directors' includes any other board, committee, or agency or any person in whom are vested the powers commonly vested in a board of directors of a common carrier, and the term 'president' includes any other chief executive in whom is vested the powers commonly vested in a president of a common carrier."

This measure warrants the prompt attention of this Congress.

MONUMENT TO "NUNS OF THE BATTLE FIELD"

MR. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing a speech delivered by former Congressman Kennedy.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting in the Record a speech delivered by ex-Congressman Kennedy. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MR. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include an address delivered at the ceremonies attending the unveiling of the monument to the "Nuns of the Battle Field," in Washington, D. C., Saturday afternoon, September 20, 1924, by Hon. Ambrose Kennedy, of Woonsocket, R. I., a former Member of Congress, who for 10 years represented in this House the third district of Rhode Island, as follows:

The leading events of the Civil War have been often repeated in the years that have since come and gone, and in every section of the country are observable numerous tablets and memorials dedicated to the deeds of chivalry and heroism that signalized that memorable struggle. The eye is always gladdened at the sight of impressive shaft and pillar proclaiming in silence the gratitude of a people to the national heroes whose genius preserved the Nation and whose lives sum up a large part of its history. Their names and fame have been and always will be held in reverent remembrance by true and loyal Americans everywhere.

In the annals of that war there is one glorious chapter that has too long remained uncelebrated, but, due to the generosity and patriotism of the women of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, we are commemorating it on this spot to-day. Here, on public ground, a new and imposing monument stands revealed. Not to the heroes but rather to the heroines of the Civil War is this splendid memorial dedicated. The advancing generations of Americans as they pass this way in the years to come and view this fine creation in bronze and granite will realize then, if they never did before, that hard by the far-flung battle lines, where shot and shell carried their terrible message of death and destruction in the war of '61, there were heroines in the garb of the Catholic sisterhoods, who, amidst these hideous surroundings, were ever ready to relieve the anguish and strengthen the hopes of the suffering and dying soldiers.

Up to 10 years ago, when the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians began to prepare the way for the erection of this memorial, very little had been heard of the services of these war-nursing sisters. Yet their devoted and patriotic ministrations shed glory upon the many thrilling occurrences of the Civil War. They were the special almoners of mercy amidst the ghastliest horrors then known to human warfare. Though suddenly and unexpectedly called into service, they were not unprepared for the trials that confronted them amidst the heartrending and revolting scenes of this crowded theater of action. If they were lacking in material equipment, by their faith and charity they were admirably prepared. These virtues they had long before pledged to the service of God and humanity. The privations incident to the havoc and confusion of war did not in the least dishearten them, for their usual practice of self-sacrifice and

self-denial enabled them to overlook the things that affected their own personal comfort and devote their attention solely to the relief and assistance of the wounded and dying. Many of these sisters came from old and famous institutions of learning in different parts of the country; many others from orphan asylums and well-established hospitals where they had hitherto presided, to answer the official call for nurses and take up the harder tasks and duties which the horrors of war entailed. Many of them, too, belonged to orders whose victories for charity constituted a bright page in the history of antecedent wars, both in Europe and America.

Hundreds of sisters, representative of 12 different orders, took active part in the service, the details of which volumes alone could unfold. The number comprised Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Sisters of the Mother Seton Order of Charity, Sisters of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy, Sisters of Providence of St. Mary of the Woods, Sisters of St. Dominic, and the Ursuline Sisters. All these furnished their respective quotas to labor in the humane and merciful work. And they did service in 18 States and in the District of Columbia, laboring in military hospitals and going from one battle field to another in ambulances, in old wagons, and in every form of vehicle that could be made available, where thousands of suffering and dying soldiers in the Blue and in the Gray were the objects of their tender ministrations. Not only did they nurse the patients, but in gentle whispers they spoke the words of consolation that lightened the burdens which oppressed the hearts of these soldiers.

In administering to the comfort of these unfortunates, these sisters exhibited a wonderful spirit of fortitude and charity, and they showed no preference whatever in the application of their labors. Their services were impartially rendered on Union and Confederate sides. When their labors were concluded, without pomp or parade, but with the calm and quiet that characterized their coming, softly and silently they returned to their pre-war occupations, and from that day to this no historian has ever recorded their names and no Congress until the Sixty-fifth had ever paid them a tribute of recognition. That Congress granted to the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians the privilege of erecting a memorial to the war-nursing sisters; and they have nobly erected it here. All honor to the public spirit and patriotism of that organization! It has called back almost from oblivion the story of those dark-robed messengers of mercy who, at the call of President Lincoln, voluntarily left the peaceful atmosphere of their accustomed surroundings to serve amidst the noxious vapors of military camp and hospital in the awful hour of misery and affliction.

The services rendered by these various sisters stand forth conspicuously, evincing a splendid heroism among the many and varied scenes of that war; and, to their honor, be it said, they never sought nor received any tangible rewards for their labors. I venture to say that, if they were living to-day, they would in their humility lay but little, if any, claim even to the recognition which this belated monument indicates. Well did they know that the works of mercy they so tenderly performed transcend the measure of reward which earthly wealth or recognition can bestow.

Many a tribute has been paid them by Union and Confederate soldiers, but none more touching or expressive than that of an eyewitness to their labors which appears in the Recollections of Abraham Lincoln.

"Of all the forms of charity and benevolence seen in the crowded wards of the hospitals, those of some Catholic sisters were among the most efficient. I never knew whence they came or what was the name of their order. More lovely than anything I have ever seen in art, so long devoted to illustrations of love, mercy, and charity, are the pictures that remain of these modest sisters going on their errands of mercy among the suffering and the dying. Gentle and womanly, yet with the courage of soldiers leading a forlorn hope, to sustain them in contact with such horrors. As they went from cot to cot, distributing the medicines prescribed, or administering the cooling, strengthening draughts as directed, they were veritable angels of mercy. Their words were suited to every sufferer. One they incited and encouraged, another they calmed and soothed. With every soldier they conversed about his home, his wife, his children, all the loved ones he was soon to see again if he was obedient and patient. How many times have I seen them exorcise pain by their presence or their words! How often has the hot forehead of the soldier grown cool as one of these sisters bathed it! How often has he been refreshed, encouraged, and assisted along the road to convalescence, when he would otherwise have fallen by the way, by the home memories with which these unpaid nurses filled his heart!"

In the hospital and military reports of the Civil War may be found here and there records of the enlistments of many of these war-nursing sisters. Some of the institutions, also, from which they went out to answer the call to service still retain the original registers of their names. From these and other sources have been carefully collated and placed in the records of Congress of the 18th of March, 1918, a long and authentic roll of their names, both family and re-

higious. But this record is by no means complete. Lapse of years has made a complete record impossible. Many of these names were assembled by a distinguished member of your order, Mrs. Ellen Ryan Jolly, who gave years of painstaking study and research to this subject and who resolved long ago that one day the name and fame of these sisters would be fittingly and publicly honored.

That happy day has arrived, and her labor of love is accomplished. Here on this piece of ground in the Nation's Capital she sees her fondest hope realized in the erection of this beautiful memorial. It is her work from its origin to its consummation. Long may it stand a testimonial to her fidelity to the righteous purpose it represents! Long may it remain to preserve and perpetuate the memory of the "Nuns of the Battle Field," whose labors for God and humanity in the trying days of the Civil War were an inspiring example of the doctrine of faith we cherish that in the performance of loyal Christian service in this life lies the surest way to eternal happiness in the life to come!

SAMUEL GOMPERS

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, my request for unanimous consent for an extension of remarks in the RECORD regarding Samuel Gompers was occasioned by many years of pleasant friendship, and, in addition, I have the conviction that he was not only a remarkable man but a great American; that he remained steadfast to the broader principles of orderly government, and that his Americanism was acquired by study, reflection, and experience. It did not come to him through birth, environment, or heredity; it was an intellectual acquisition.

I have disagreed with him on many matters, but in the matter of American patriotism he was splendid.

He had brilliant wit of a sympathetic kind which did not hurt.

More men called him by his first name than any other man that ever lived, and he had the remarkable faculty of remembering names, and the first name or a nickname were the handles he usually applied.

There was a perpetual conflict going on within his great brain, developed by study, experience, and contact with men, and his big heart, which was always interested in the sentimental—in music, art, and good fellowship.

Children liked him. He was fond of animals. He had courage of a high order. He could say "no" upon occasion when to do so invited defeat.

To retain for nearly half a century leadership over the diversified interests—sometimes impatient demands—of the organized labor movement in this country presents a record unparalleled in the labor history of the world.

No wonder that upon his death the press of the country unite in speaking well of him! Great chiefs of industry, with whom he clashed and fought, respect his memory, and I feel sure he will be hard to replace.

He had that vast experience which is the best teacher, and his successor, no matter how able or well informed, can not come prepared, because no man now living has such a long record of the things that have gone before. Few men have the retentive memory possessed by him. His experience and memory were two strong elements of his great power.

I met him frequently under very trying circumstances. On one occasion, during the peace conference in Paris, accompanied by a delegation of representatives of American labor, just at a period when America's participation in the great World War had astounded Europe, every device of cajolery and appeal was pressed upon him to lead the American delegates to the international conference of labor leaders to be held at Berne, Switzerland.

I was present in Paris at the time, and in conversation with "Sam" when he was approached by American correspondents with an inquiry as to whether the American representatives of labor would attend the international convention of radicals to be held in Berne his answer was emphatic and in picturesque form. He stated the Americans would not go or become a party to such convention, as it did not represent the thought of American labor. I was impressed with his emphasis and his clear way of repudiating any connection or sympathy with the Bolshevik movement.

He fought to the utmost for labor, but his contentions for betterment were made under orderly and accepted legal methods.

He understood our theory of government, and any proposals from him were to be employed by legal enactments; and even in proposing changes they were rarely, if ever, of a revolutionary character.

He led American labor in supporting President Wilson during the war.

My feeling of personal friendship for this man was based upon many pleasant conversations on subjects which did not relate to labor problems, but on one occasion, upon being called upon to deliver an address upon the subject of labor, I reviewed some of his statements and speeches. Among many I found the following, showing vision, breadth, and statesmanship:

I do not know that I am entitled to very great credit because I am not a Bolshevik. With my understanding of American institutions and American opportunities, I repeat that the man who would not be a patriot in defense of the institutions of our country would be undeserving of the privilege of living in this country.

Again he said:

I stand in so far as I can and dare—and I dare much—for the principles of natural and national development and growth.

I am opposed, as is organized labor of America, to any destructive policy.

There is nothing that is worth while maintaining that I would aid or abet in destroying.

Our policy, our work, our method, our ideas, and our ideals, are to build, to construct, to grow, to help in the development of the highest and best in the human family; to make to-day a better day than yesterday, to make to-morrow a better day than to-day, to make to-morrow and to-morrow's to-morrow each a better day than the one that has gone before. That evolutionary process of progress and improvement is the basis for the opportunity for freedom, justice, and democracy.

He believed that American organized labor occupied a middle place in between extreme capitalistic selfishness and the I. W. W. and kindred movements of what he termed "irresponsibles" or "irreconcilables."

It is a question of dealing with such a movement as represented by the American trade-unions—the American Federation of Labor—or dealing with a body of irresponsibles or irreconcilables. If we are not on the right track, then those who represent the wildest orgy of destruction with no consideration for the rights of individuals will come to the front. It is a matter of choice between dealing with such elements or dealing with the constructive forces of the organized-labor movement of our country.

We find a touch of Jefferson and a thought from Wilson in this statement:

Freedom is not a condition, nor is democracy a condition. Freedom is the exercise, the functioning of freedom, the practice of freedom, the practice of democracy. All that society can give, all that government can give, is the opportunity for freedom. It depends upon the people to be intelligent and grow into the feeling, the exercise, and practice of the function of freedom. It was because the principles of freedom and democracy were menaced by the system of autocracy and militarism that the people of our country and the peoples of other countries and of the democracies of the world rallied around their banners and declared and made good their willingness to make the supreme sacrifice for the principles, the institutions, and the practice of freedom which were threatened to be overwhelmed and crushed.

He never permitted fine-spun theories and impracticable political panaceas to control his movements or change his convictions, as illustrated in this statement:

The field is littered with the whitened bones of those who have gone seeking salvation through laws. This the American labor movement has recognized, and there is no immediate danger that this philosophy will be deserted in favor of whims and caprices of similar portent. In the realm of political life there is always present the great personal necessity for remaining in political life. In the realm of industry there is only the necessity of going forward with the tasks and battles of industrial life, out of which we can not emerge even if we should wish to. The facts are inescapable, the battles must be fought where they are. Industry is real, as real as tools, and iron, and coal, and wheat. Men can lay their hands to the things of industry and get the feel of them. There is definiteness in industry, a great, all-enveloping, all-enfolding definiteness that comes as natural to mankind as life itself, because he goes through life by the feel of these things of industry.

There is nothing fixed and definite in the realm of abstraction, in the realm of politics. It lends itself to a false understanding of things that are real. When men depart from the fundamental productive process of the life of the world there is no power on earth

that can guarantee the accuracy of the course they still pursue. Look back upon the record of falsity made by these movements of abstraction in the war. Against such error the American labor movement in its loyalty to the cause of mankind sets its face and must continue to set its face.

He had but four years in school but became a great writer and speaker of unusual attainment. He was without affectation and hit from the shoulder.

To-day thoughtful American people in high places and in low are honoring the memory of Samuel Gompers, and the Russian people, as reported by the newspapers, are driving Trotsky from his rule.

The American Jew, Samuel Gompers, fought the Russian Jew, Trotsky, and, more than any other man, stopped the spread of Bolshevism in this country.

He opposed sabotage and communism and defeated it by upholding trade-unionism.

He knew that our forefathers, in their declarations of equality, did not mean that all men were created equal mentally, morally, and physically, but that all men had the equal right to the law's protection and equal rights to the world's opportunities for life and happiness.

He did not understand that liberty was license, and he knew that a democracy which degenerates may quickly turn to lawlessness, and after a brief period of misrule would become the prey of some strong man. This was the history of nations, which he had read and understood.

He knew that democracy was ordered liberty, which should respect and safeguard the rights of all.

There were many discouragements for him because of the impatience which would proceed with more speed than safety.

He knew better than most men that conditions are improved by steadily gaining point upon point and not by pulling down good and bad together in one hasty action.

He never had the dream that government could make everyone rich but believed it should give an equal opportunity to become rich.

He believed in preserving the real things which are worth while and to bring about by persuasion changes which were desired through the ballot and the suffrage in the old-fashioned way.

He knew that without law property, life, order, and happiness are impossible.

His method was to educate the voice of the majority.

Experience and history had taught there could be but one basis of settlement—an American one—made under the law, and there can be but one flag—the American flag.

The American people will watch with interest the naming of his successor. Will he understand our institutions as Mr. Gompers did?

Will he have his sagacity, his diplomacy, his broad sympathy, and, above all, his patience?

If his successor adopts the thoughts of Mr. Gompers as a guide, then truly his last words will be an inspiration for the man who follows him. Turning to his nurse, the great American labor chief said, in his parting breath:

This is the end. God bless our American institutions. May they grow better day by day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. CHOLL (at the request of Mr. CUMMINGS) was granted leave of absence for five days on account of death in his family.

BILLS LAID ON THE TABLE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, two measures, House Joint Resolution 181 and the bill H. R. 7887, will be laid on the table, similar bills having become laws.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 12, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3842. A bill to provide for terms of the United States circuit and dis-

trict courts at Denton, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. J. Res. 240. A joint resolution confirming the execution of an agreement to settle the boundary line between the States of New York and Connecticut, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5083. A bill to create an additional judge in the district of Maryland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1037). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9435. A bill to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 365. A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information regarding Robert J. Owens, a prohibition agent; adverse (Rept. No. 1040). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 10644) to provide for a site and public building at Winter Haven, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10645) granting consent of Congress to the Valley Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande near Hidalgo, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 10646) for the relief of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 10647) extending time for the completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River between the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 10648) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Ambridge and Woodlawn, Beaver County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10649) to permit certain national associations to operate booths in public buildings containing post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 10650) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Lithuania to the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10651) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Poland to the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10652) to permit certain national associations to furnish post offices with cancellation dies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LA GUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 378) to determine the number of immigrants who have entered the United States from the Republic of Mexico from July 1, 1924, to December 1, 1924, their destination and occupation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10653) granting an increase of pension to Sallie A. Palmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10654) granting an increase of pension to Elizabetha Oswald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 10655) granting a pension to James B. Bentley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10656) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Crist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10657) for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10658) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREDERICKS: A bill (H. R. 10659) granting a pension to Sarah A. Stubblefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10660) granting a pension to Robert W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10661) granting a pension to Frederick M. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10662) granting a pension to Melissa J. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10663) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10664) granting a pension to William Bleckwendt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 10665) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 10666) granting an increase of pension to Jane O. Stinnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 10667) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10668) granting a pension to Robert Zink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 10669) granting an increase of pension to Oscar S. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS: A bill (H. R. 10670) for the relief of Frederick S. Easter; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 10671) granting an increase of pension to Mattie L. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10672) for the relief of the Guamoco Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10673) for the relief of Alice P. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10674) granting a pension to Ophelia C. McKnight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 10675) granting a pension to Leo Pope Ott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLFF: A bill (H. R. 10676) granting a pension to Henrietta Rowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 10677) granting an increase of pension to Phebe A. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 10678) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3151. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Thomas Brennan Post, No. 380, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, urging repeal of the law authorizing the Director of the Mint to issue memorial 50-cent pieces, the profits from the sale of these coins to be turned over to the Stone Mountain Memorial Association of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3152. Also (by request), petition of Courtland Sanders Post, No. 21, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring repeal of legislation which authorizes the Director of the Mint to issue memorial 50-cent pieces, the profits from the sale of these coins to be turned over to the Stone Mountain Memorial Association of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3153. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., opposing the enactment into law of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3154. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Kearsarge Association of Naval Veterans, Boston, Mass., recommending construction

of a cruiser for the United States Navy to be named the *Kearsarge*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3155. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Oxford, Wis., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 3218, compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3156. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the secretary of the Central Union Label Council, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Jones bill, for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sundays; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3157. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 73 citizens of Campbell County, Ky., against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) or the passage of any other religious legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3158. By Mr. WEFALD: Petition of 74 Chippewa Indians of Deer River, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3159. Also, petition of 28 Chippewa Indians of Rochert, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3160. Also, petition of 57 Chippewa Indians of Beaulieu, Minn., praying for a \$100 per capita payment from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3161. Also, petition of 53 Chippewa Indians of Pine Bend, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3162. Also, petition of 16 Chippewa Indians of Ebro, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3163. Also, petition of 89 Chippewa Indians of Cass Lake, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3164. Also, petition of 43 Chippewa Indians of Naytauwaush, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3165. Also, petition of 136 Chippewa Indians of Mahnomen, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3166. Also, petition of 26 Chippewa Indians of International Falls, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3167. Also, petition of 52 Chippewa Indians of Rice Lake District, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3168. Also, petition of 62 Chippewa Indians of Fosston, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3169. Also, petition of 32 Chippewa Indians of Lengby, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3170. Also, petition of 39 Chippewa Indians of Rogalskis Mill, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3171. Also, petition of 55 Chippewa Indians of Detroit, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 out of their tribal fund to assist them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3172. Also, petition of 11 Chippewa Indians of Waubun, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 out of their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3173. By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Petition of George Morell and 51 other citizens of Collyer, Quinter, and Wakeeney, Kans., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3174. By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of citizens of Big Rapids, Mich., opposing any favorable action on Senate bill 3218, called the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.